# THEOLOGY

## A MONTHLY REVIEW

L. LII. No. 345 MARCH, 1949

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

Editorial

The "Errors" of Lutheranism - - - - *Gustaf Aulén*

On Observing the Fasts of the Church - - *R. P. Symonds*

American Letter: No. 2 - - - - - *E. R. Hardy, Jr*

The Devil and the Temptations of our Lord according to St Luke - - - - *F. J. Glendenning*

*For full list of contents see within.*

---

Edited by Alec R. Vidler at Windsor Castle, and published by the S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

per copy. 12s. per annum, post free.

e U.S.A. $3.60 payable to the Macmillan Co., 60 Fifth Avenue, New York 11 N.Y.

# THEOLOGY

Editorial communications should be addressed to: The Rev. Alec R. Vidler, D.D., 8, The Cloisters, Windsor Castle, Berks. (MSS should not exceed 3,500 words, and should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed envelope.)

Business communications (including books for review) to: The S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C.2.

*Advisory Committee*

Montgomery Belgion
The Rev. Frank Bennett
The Rev. L. J. Collins
The Rev. W. W. S. March
The Rev. Prof. E. C. Ratcliff
The Rev. Prof. Norman Sykes, D.Phil.

*Editorial Representative in the U.S.A.:* The Rev. W. Norman Pittenger, General Theological Seminary, Chelsea Square, New York City

## CONTENTS

| | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| Editorial | | 81 |
| The " Errors " of Lutheranism | *Gustaf Aulén* | 82 |
| On Observing the Fasts of the Church | *R. P. Symonds* | 91 |
| American Letter: No. 2 | *E. R. Hardy, Jr* | 97 |
| The Devil and the Temptations of our Lord according to St Luke | *F. J. Glendenning* | 102 |
| *Correspondence:* | | |
| The Ministry | *Stephen Neill, Michael Ramsey and Edward Every* | 106 |
| The Convocation of Canterbury | *G. R. Dunstan* | 110 |
| *Book Reviews:* | | |
| C. S. Phillips and others, *Walter Howard Frere* | *F. E. P. S. Langton* | 111 |
| T. H. Croxall, *Kierkegaard Studies* | *M. Chaning-Pearce* | 113 |
| Ruth Rouse, *The World's Student Christian Federation* | *R. Ambrose Reeves* | 114 |
| Frederic Thieberger, *King Solomon* | *T. N. D. C. Salmon* | 115 |
| Klaus Mann, *André Gide and the Crisis of Modern Thought* | *Montgomery Belgion* | 116 |
| *Shorter Notices* | | 119 |
| *Books Received* | | 120 |

# THEOLOGY

VOL. LII MARCH, 1949 No. 345

## Editorial

THE duty of fasting and abstinence is one about which there has been for a long time much uncertainty in theory and much negligence in practice, not only in the Church of England. It is appropriate that it should be considered afresh during the season of Lent, and we are glad to be able to provide an essay on the subject in this number.

For several years we have wished to publish an article that would deal with the particular question of "fasting communion," but we have found that it is difficult to find anyone who is willing to broach the subject, though there seems to be wide agreement that it needs to be broached. We will therefore try to indicate, briefly if not boldly, some of the questions that we should like to see answered.

1. Is it not the case that the movement towards making the "parish communion" the chief service on Sundays is impeded by hesitations and misgivings about the need to celebrate it at an hour when the communicants can reasonably be expected to be fasting, which is here taken to mean that they should have had nothing to eat or drink since the previous midnight? Were it not for these misgivings, it would seem obvious that the service should be held at the hour when the largest number of church members in each parish can conveniently assemble; the hour that would be most suitable would vary widely in different types of parish. Ought not this to be the governing consideration, unless it can be shown that the duty of communicating fasting is of obligation and that all other considerations must be subordinated to that?

2. We cited in THEOLOGY, April, 1947 (p. 122), this remark of an English clergyman: "Needless to say, the sacrament (*i.e.*, holy communion) is received fasting, as it always must be." We should like to know on what authority the supposed obligation rests. In 1928 the late Dr Percy Dearmer published a book entitled *The Truth about Fasting, with special reference to Fasting-Communion*, in which he said that to his intense astonishment he found that "the rule upon which so much stress had been laid was based upon a chain of 'testimonies,' each of which, on examination, proved to be unable to bear the burden which was placed upon them" (*op. cit.*, p. 2). It is not necessary to be a "Dearmerite" in order to recognize that this book is a learned, candid, and comprehensive investigation which deserves to be taken much more seriously than it has been so far. Have its contentions anywhere been refuted? If so, where? If they have not been and cannot be, must we not conclude that the fast before communion is a matter not of general obligation, but of personal devotion?

3. Have those members of the Church of England who say tha the sacrament must always be received fasting reckoned with th fact that in the Roman Catholic Church on the Continent remark able changes have been taking place both in the provision of after noon and evening masses and opportunities of communion and i relaxing the rules about fasting reception?[1] These changes, which are at present experimental, have been mainly induced by the prac tical desire to celebrate the sacrament at times and under condition when most members of the Church, especially the workers, will b able to communicate, but the theological tradition on which th rule of fasting communion rested is also being re-examined.

4. We have heard it argued that the Roman Catholics can afford to relax their discipline in this matter, because in other respect their system of discipline is strong and will continue in operation whereas there is so little discipline of this sort in the Church o England that abandonment of the attempt to insist on fasting com munion would be tolerable only if some other positive discipline were to be established in its place. We suspect that the fast before communion is practised in the Church of England very much less than would be necessary in order to give this argument force. But anyhow, if the case for fasting communion as an obligation does not stand up to investigation, it is wrong to go on pretending tha it does. Would it not be better to concentrate on teaching abou those ways of preparing for the communion which are by genera consent a matter of duty for all (see the last question and answer in the Church Catechism), and at the same time to give fresh attention to the place that fasting and abstinence ought to occupy, the pur pose they ought to serve, and the forms they ought to take in th regular life of a contemporary Christian man?

---

## The "Errors" of Lutheranism

In an Anglo-Scandinavian meeting associated with the Lambeth Conference this year I had the opportunity of discussing some state ments about Lutheranism to be found in the pamphlet *Catholicity: A Study in the Conflict of Christian Traditions in the West: Being a Report presented to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury.*

Certainly this little pamphlet is very interesting and in many respects very valuable. The desires of its authors to serve the cause of Christian unity are manifest, and their presentation of the conflict of Christian traditions ought to be observed and carefully studied everywhere in Christendom. Nevertheless, I cannot but say that the character and position of Lutheranism, as presented and criticized in this pamphlet, have been seriously misunderstood.

Before entering into details, I am moved to lay down the general

[1] *E.g.*, see *Les Questions liturgiques et paroissiales*, April-June, 1946, pp. 101, 107 f; July-December, 1947, pp. 157 ff., 179; and January-June, 1948, a long and important article, *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, February, 1948.

proposition that what is here criticized as Lutheranism is not the true Lutheranism at all. It is rather a type of Pietism, such as has admittedly been widely influential in many Churches and denominations, including Lutheranism, but which differs widely in outlook not only from the older Lutheranism of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but also from the Lutheranism of today, as that is to be found (for example) in the Church of Sweden. The pamphlet *Catholicity* has rightly treated of "The Renaissance and Liberalism" in a special section. The influence of "Liberal" theology is to be found among Christians of all confessional types, Lutherans of course not excluded. But just as it would be misleading to describe Lutheranism as a variety of Liberalism, so it is no less misleading to describe it as a kind of Pietism. The analysis would have been clearer if *Catholicity* had introduced a special section for Pietism, just as it has a special section for the Renaissance and Liberalism. I turn from these general remarks to consider the detailed criticisms brought forward against Lutheranism in *Catholicity*.

1. The first concerns the *doctrine of man*, in respect of which it is stated that Lutheran teaching is characterized by a "catastrophic pessimism." This is a criticism which goes back to the age of the Enlightenment, and which has been repeated constantly since that time. Admittedly the Reformation speaks of human sin, and of evil generally, in the most radical terms. To understand rightly, however, what is meant, it is most essential to observe how, and in what context, Lutheranism speaks of the radical sinfulness and moral impotence of man. The radical view in question stands in relation to "justification" (*iustitia coram Deo*). The idea is that man cannot of himself produce any *iustitia* which could be valid before God, cannot produce any "works" which could be presented to God as a basis for His justifying judgment. Before God man always appears as a sinner, which means (for this, too, is part of the doctrine) that "justification" is a free gift of God's grace. The intention of the famous formula *iustificatio sola fide* (sometimes misunderstood even in Lutheranism itself) is chiefly to guarantee the word *sola* in the formula *sola gratia. Sola fide* means nothing but "through God's *agape* alone" or "through Christ alone."

It must be observed, further, that this point of view—this emphasis upon *iustificatio* as a gift—concerns not only the initial stage of the Christian life but also the Christian life as a whole. According to Luther the Christian, so long as he lives on earth, is *simul iustus et peccator*. This second very important formula expresses with unsurpassed clearness the realistic outlook of Lutheranism. Sanctification never means that the Christian could reach a point at which his own qualifications would be a basis for fellowship with God. The Christian, throughout the whole course of his earthly life, remains a sinner; but at the same time this sinner, through the grace of God, is incorporated into fellowship with God, and thus justified. Every perfectionist view, and all false idealization of the Christian life, are here excluded.

Yet it would be a complete misunderstanding to regard this con-

ception of man as leading to a black pessimism, or as proclaimir a doctrine of man's complete moral impotence and entire incapaci to achieve anything "good." Ideas of that kind are to be found i Pietism, but they are very remote from the true Lutheranism. A important distinction needs to be drawn between *iustitia cora Deo* and *iustitia civilis*, as also a no less important distinction b tween a *primus usus* and a *secundus usus* of the Law of God. Th first function or *primus usus* of the universal Law of the Creator to produce order out of chaos, to keep evil within bounds, to crus injustice, and to promote justice in human relationships. Thus th Law of God is at once a *dynamis*, by means of which God conten in conflict with evil, and at the same time constitutes the foundatio of all human relationships. Considered from this point of viev the Lutheran conception of man is not simply a pessimistic on On the contrary, the fact that the Law of God is in operative fun tion means and involves that man—not merely the Christian ma but man as such, "natural" man—has it within his capacity achieve what is useful and (in a relative sense) righteous and goo in accordance with the ordering of social life and its claims; and i so far as such actions subserve the will of God by establishing ord instead of chaos, by checking injustice and evil, and by maintainir (in whatever degree) the principle that a man should care for h neighbours, they are in harmony with the universal Law of th Creator. Of course, it has to be emphasized that the "goodness" i volved in such actions is only a relative goodness. Nevertheless, th which is good only in a relative sense belongs still to the sphere goodness. And it has to be observed, further, that no human actio —not even Christian actions—are more than relatively good. Huma actions in history never transcend the bounds of relativity.

The position of Lutheranism appears in a clearer light if cor pared with that of Pietism. Pietism had no interest in the line thought which finds characteristic expression in such phrases *iustitia civilis* and "first function of the Law." On the contrary, f Pietism the significance of the Law is limited exclusively to i power to bring about conviction of sin (that is, to what Luthera ism describes as the *second* function of the Law). Pietism therefor directing its attention exclusively towards salvation and considerir salvation in isolation from creation, was led to take up an attitu of complete pessimism towards the "natural man," a pessimis however, which was accompanied by an idealized view of the Chri tian life. The world outside Christianity was regarded as profan and the "natural man" as incapable of doing anything good. Th Christian, on the other hand, having been changed, was regarded being able to fulfil the Law of God. Even if Pietism as a rule di not dare to teach the complete sinlessness of Christians, its outlo invariably tended to be perfectionist. Sin, in so far as it remain in the Christian, was regarded as a vanishing quantity.

The result of our inquiry is that the "pessimistic" view of ma criticized in *Catholicity*, is characteristic indeed of Pietism, but n of Lutheranism. According to Pietism, the "natural man" cann

do anything that is good. According to Lutheranism, natural man has the capacity to do what is *relatively* good, and what is useful for human fellowship. This outlook in Lutheranism connects with the doctrine of Creation (which in Lutheranism certainly is not neglected), and especially with the idea that the Law of God is an universal law, acting as a *dynamis* which fights evil and promotes order and justice in human life. The world, thus regarded, is not divided as in Pietism into two parts, the one religious and the other profane. On the contrary, nothing which exists is profane, in the sense of being excluded from the will of the Creator. When Lutheranism speaks of man's "total depravity" and moral "impotence," such language relates simply to the question of man's salvation. What is meant is that in the sight of God man is disclosed as a sinner; that the judgment of God does not hit just this or that particular action on man's part, but man as such, whole and entire; and that there exists no other kind of salvation for man than salvation through the *agape* of God—that is, through Christ. If on the one hand it were to be asserted that sin affects man only in a relatively superficial way and does not go down to the roots of his being, if it were desired to maintain that man can at least partly *earn* his own salvation and fellowship with God, or if on the other hand it were desired to interpret the Christian life in terms of perfectionism and to deny the essential relativity of all human goodness, then indeed it would be inevitable that the Lutheran conception of man and of man's salvation would have to be regarded as being erroneous.

Two remarks should perhaps here be added. The Lutheran outlook, as here described, does not of course mean a denial of human activity. Obviously the *agape* of God claims from man the full exercise of his active powers. It is simply that this activity on man's part ought not so to be interpreted as to nullify the truth safeguarded by the phrase *sola gratia*. Then further, in the second place, there does not seem to exist any reason for being unduly concerned about the question of a "point of contact" in man. Is not this issue in fact more or less an illusory one? If salvation exists as a reality, it is obvious that all necessary conditions of salvation must also exist.

2. A second point criticized in *Catholicity* is concerned with the problem of Natural Law. *Catholicity* is right, notwithstanding the fact that there are positive pronouncements on the subject of Natural Law discoverable in the Lutheran tradition, in saying that Luther himself "rejected the scholastic Natural Theology and doctrine of Natural Law." This, however, as we have already seen, does not mean that he underestimated the importance of the Law of God. On the contrary, the thought of the universal Law of the Creator occupied a very firm position in his teaching. It is quite true that he could speak, as St Paul had done before him, of the abolition of the Law. The Law was abolished *in loco iustificationis*: here it had no voice, and was impotent to condemn the man who had received forgiveness through Christ. But the Law was abolished *only in loco iustificationis*; everywhere else Law is in function in its majesty,

firm and unshaken, expressing the holy will of God, claiming t determine all human relationships. Indeed, it may be claimed th the Law of the Creator was rather more strongly emphasized Lutheranism than in the scholastic theology of the Middle Age The difference was that Lutheranism preferred to speak of th universal Law of the Creator, where the scholastic theology spo of Natural Law. Even this difference should not be exaggerated, i asmuch as the scholastic theology undoubtedly thought that th Natural Law was at the same time a Divine Law, more or less coi ciding in respect of its content with the Ten Commandments. Fro this point of view it might even seem to matter little whethe theology used the language of Natural Law or referred to the un versal Law of the Creator. Nevertheless, the critical attitude take up by Luther in relation to the idea of Natural Law has its signi cance, a significance which becomes obvious if we look at the histo of the idea of Law in the most recent centuries.

The course of this history has been a very unhappy one. We ha been witnessing a continual dissolution of moral principles, and th result can be described only as moral chaos. In this deplorab situation we occasionally hear voices urging a return to the Law Nature. Nevertheless, the possibilities of this particular way of escap may be questioned. It cannot but be remembered that the Enlighte ment once tried to save the universality of the Law by emphasi ing in the strongest manner the idea of the Law of Nature, regarde as being grounded in Reason, but that this attitude proved in potent to avert the dissolution which followed. The supposed bas in Reason of the Natural Law could not be maintained. On th contrary, the idea of a Natural Law, as being a metaphysical ide was subjected to a dissolving philosophical criticism. That being s it must be asked whether indeed it can be advisable to return to th idea of a Natural Law. From the point of view of Christianity appears more advisable to hold strongly to the universal Law God the Creator. To accept the Law of Nature instead of this un versal Law of God is to accept what is merely a substitute, an indeed, even a feeble substitute, inasmuch as the supposed "ratio ality" of the Natural Law has to all appearance turned out to b illusory. The position here taken up does not mean the isolation Christianity, nor does it mean that there is being claimed fo Christianity a monopoly in the moral sphere. On the contrary, the *universality* of the Creator's Law is duly maintained, all isol tionist as well as all monopolizing tendencies (such, for example, are to be found in Pietism) are broken down.

3. *Catholicity* finds that "Protestantism" as a whole has bee guilty of "a false identification of the spiritual with the no material," and in this connexion remarks that "In Lutheranis especially there has been a readiness to let the affairs of gover ment be managed by the Prince—originally the Christian Princ but later the secularized world-power—while the Christians co cerned themselves with piety." The meaning of this statement obviously that Lutheranism should be regarded as being characte

ized by passivity and indifference *in relation to society*. Lutheranism has, in fact, often been criticized on these lines, and not least in the most recent times. Nor do I deny that it is possible to adduce reasons for such a criticism, more especially in respect of the Lutheranism of Germany. It has to be deeply deplored that there have been German theologians who have even theoretically defended such a position, speaking of the *Eigengesetzlichkeit* of the State as being a "Lutheran" view and thereby compromising Lutheranism.

Yet some further remarks may be added. In the first place, passivity and undue complaisance in relation to the State are certainly not to be found only in Lutheranism. The Orthodox Churches in particular have, perhaps more than any other Churches, exhibited such an attitude; and it may not be impossible to find traces of such compliance even in the history of Anglicanism. Secondly, Luther's much debated idea of the two different governments, the secular and the spiritual, was not intended as a justification of any *Eigengesetzlichkeit* on the part of the State. Admittedly Luther considered the State as a divine order; but that meant that the State was at the same time subject to the universal Law of the Creator. In so far as the State failed to fulfil the behests of this Law, it wore the aspect, according to Luther's teaching, of a servant of the Devil. It was the duty in such circumstances of the Church (*i.e.*, of the spiritual government) to "admonish the conscience" of the civil rulers and to keep faithful watch over the sanctity of the divine Law. In the third place, nothing could be more fundamentally remote from Lutheranism than a separation between "piety" and the life of the world. The Lutheran doctrine of creation and the emphasis which accompanied it upon the Law of the Creator excludes all possibility of any such isolation of piety.

4. According to *Catholicity*, though the Lutheran doctrine of Justification has in itself a markedly "objective" orientation, the doctrine of Sanctification in Lutheranism is, on the contrary, characterized by subjectivism and the cultivation of religious feelings. *Catholicity* finds here a dissociation of Justification from Sanctification and indicates that as a "radical error" on Luther's part. The authors appear to think that "objectivism" has in the doctrine of Justification been overstressed, and that that explains why Sanctification is interpreted too subjectively: "A truth that is expressed out of proportion to other truths sometimes becomes strangely changed into its direct opposite": and the reason of this strange change is, according to *Catholicity*, that man seeks to maintain his faith-relationship with God outside the framework of the sacramental life.

I have found a number of statements in *Catholicity* somewhat surprising, but perhaps none so surprising as this one. Nothing can be more obvious than that *Catholicity* here has confused Lutheranism with Pietism. I have, from the days of my childhood, heard thousands of sermons in which it has been said again and again that the use of the "means of grace" is the only way to sanctification, and that all the strength of the Christian life comes from this source. *Catholicity* says that the regular Catholic teaching "concentrates on

the objectivity of that which is sacramentally given." You will find exactly the same Catholic objectivity in Lutheranism. The one difference seems to be that while *Catholicity* confines objectivity to the framework of the sacramental life, Lutheranism emphasizes the Word of God as well as the Sacraments—"Consecrate them in the truth: thy word is truth" (John xvii, 17). Certainly that does not mean any weakening of the objective outlook. Whatever else may be found in Lutheranism, there is not to be found there any cultivation of the feelings. On the contrary, there are to be heard in Lutheran teaching constant warnings against all tendencies to build on "experiences" and "feelings," and constant references to the Word of God and to His Sacraments, to the Sacraments as well as to the Word. If the eucharistic life of the Churches of Lutheran Christianity has not always been what it ought to be, that deplorable fact does not depend on the principles of Lutheranism, but results from the failure to realize those principles, which certainly most strongly emphasize the vital importance of the Holy Communion.

5. According to a very well known statement of Luther, "The Church is the Mother that gives birth to and nourishes every Christian." Yet in *Catholicity* I read: "Both Lutheranism and Calvinism imply a doctrine of the union of individual souls in the way of salvation prior to their incorporation in the visible Church." This view of Lutheranism must be pronounced to be quite wrong. If the Church is the mother who gives birth to every Christian, the individual cannot possibly be prior to the Church. Certainly the order according to Lutheranism is precisely the order which *Catholicity* describes as Catholic: Christ—the visible Church—the individual Christian. The idea of the Church as a union of individuals who already are partakers of salvation is a typical pietistic view, quite strange to Lutheranism. As regards the terms "invisible" and "visible" Church, I think that theology would do well if it refrained from using them. These terms, *when contrasted with each other*, have never contributed to the lucidity of the idea of the Church. Their influence has been a confusing one. The "invisible" Church is only an abstract idea; the "visible" Church, as contrasted with the invisible, readily degenerates into a caricature. The Church which is the Mother of every Christian is, of course, no other than the Church of history, the Church of Christ and His Apostles, living and working through the centuries. It may be said that this Church belongs to two worlds, or two æons. She is not "of this world," but she lives and works and fights in this world for the Kingdom of God. She has both a divine and a human side. We may speak of the glory of the Church, and of her shame. But there exists only one Church and this Church is the Mother of every Christian. As we consider the achievement of the Church in history, the achievement of the living Christ through His Church, it is very difficult to understand the criticism expressed in *Catholicity*, when the authors assert that "Protestantism" on the whole is characterized by a "retreat from history": "We are left" (they write) "with the soul of man confronted directly with Calvary as the one significant moment in

history" (pp. 24 f.). It must surely be observed at this point in the first place that Calvary cannot be isolated from the Resurrection of Christ, and in the second place that the Resurrection means the starting-point of the work, continually in process, of *Christus Victor* as He realizes, through His Church, His work or salvation in human life. No idea can be more central for Lutheranism than this. I must be excused if I say that this habit of constructing contrasts between "Protestants" and "Catholics" seems to me to be somewhat queer.

Before leaving the subject of the Church I add a few further observations. During our Anglo-Scandinavian discussions, one of the prominent Anglican theologians asked us Scandinavian Bishops if we considered our Churches to be "new" Churches, dating from the time of the Reformation. I will try to explain how strange such an idea must seem to us. In my diocese the Gospel was first preached by the Englishman Eskil, who suffered the martyr's death about 1080 at Strängnäs, where very soon after his death the Bishop's See was constituted. In this part of Sweden 75 per cent. of the churches are medieval in date, many of them very beautiful, with medieval reredoses, vestments, etc. On solemn occasions I wear in my cathedral a cope more than 500 years old which once belonged to one of the most famous of the Bishops in the diocese. The structure of our liturgy goes back to the old Church, and the ancient Gregorian tones are still used in our liturgical music. The liturgical tradition is in certain respects more carefully preserved even than in the Book of Common Prayer. How could it be possible that a Church living and working under such conditions could consider itself as a "new" Church, begun at the Reformation? It may be added that the idea of a new Church never occurred, and never would have occurred, to Luther, who, moreover, would never allow his own name to be connected with the Church. The word "Reformation" itself stresses the continuity—it would be meaningless to speak of a "Reformation" if continuity did not exist. Archbishop Nathan Söderblom used to speak of the Church of Sweden as an Evangelical Catholic Church, and I think he was right in so doing. The only caution to be observed is that the word "Evangelical," as thus used, is in no sense to be interpreted as having the character of a party name.

6. The problem of *Scripture and Tradition* has often been discussed between Anglicans and Lutherans, and it is probable that it will continue to be so discussed. I believe, however, that it is becoming possible to discuss it with greater fruitfulness as a result of the far-reaching change of exegetical outlook, which is one of the most striking features of the contemporary theological situation. Lutheranism has from the first referred to the Scriptures as the supreme authority (*norma normans*). As regards Tradition, considered as a secondary authority (*norma normata*), the student will find reference made to the ecumenical *symbola*, as well as to the special tradition of Lutheranism itself as set forth in its confessional documents. Now it can, in fact, be questioned whether this principle of Lutheranism has always been consistently applied. When *Catholicity* speaks of the "Lutheran method" as having been "to interpret the Scrip-

tures in the light of a particular doctrine," the statement may be justified in so far as it has not seldom happened that the tradition of the Reformation, and especially the writings of Luther himself, have been used as a measure according to which the whole history of Christianity has been measured and judged. Such an attitude, wherever the principle of the supreme authority of the Bible was not realized, involved inevitably an isolation of Lutheranism. According to the true principle of Lutheranism, Luther and the Reformation can only have authority in so far as they help towards the better understanding of the message of the Bible.

The exegetical investigations of our own time now seem, however, to be promoting a new and fresh outlook upon the problem of the relation of Scripture to Tradition. So long as the so-called "liberal" exegesis prevailed, the result was not only that Bible and Tradition were regarded as opposing factors, but also that a supposed opposition was discovered to exist within the Bible itself between the teaching of Jesus and the doctrine of the Apostles. Now it is obvious that this outlook was a construction built not upon the Bible itself but upon modernizing presuppositions. Actually, despite all variations, the message of the Bible stands out as a single message, one, firm, and definite, coming down to us through the witness of the Apostolic Church. Bible and Tradition, therefore, the Bible and the Apostolic Church, cannot be separated the one from the other. From this point of view, *Catholicity* rightly says that an appeal to the Bible or to the Gospel means at the same time an appeal "to the Apostolic Church as the witness and keeper of both." It is not my intention to suggest that the discussion about the relation between Bible and Tradition is thereby brought to an end. But at least a new starting point has been reached for a better understanding of the problem.

In this short article it has only been possible for me to deal with a few points in the analysis of Lutheranism in *Catholicity*. I must frankly confess that when I first read this analysis I was somewhat disappointed, since in the description given in *Catholicity* I could not recognize Lutheranism as I knew it in my home Church and as the result of my acquaintance with Lutheran theology. On closer consideration, however, my doubts were turned into satisfaction since it became obvious that the community of outlook between the theology of Lutheranism and that of Anglicanism, as described in *Catholicity*, was far deeper than the authors supposed. Let me only add, in conclusion, that it has not been at all my intention to efface or to reduce the differences between the two systems. Differences of course there are, differences in outlook as well as in Church life, differences which in both cases bring with them a true measure of enrichment. But this article has not tried to deal with the differences. Rather has it been written because, as it appears to the writer, there is no reason to make the differences deeper than they really are, or to provoke them where they do not exist.

GUSTAF AULÉN.

# On Observing the Fasts of the Church

As a child I was brought up to abstain from the flesh of mammals on the days appointed as fasts in the Prayer Book, to which were added the Wednesdays in Advent, I imagine in imitation of Romanist custom. However admirable that was in many ways, it cannot today be taken as settling the matter for Anglicans; for there are considerations, theological and practical, that make so simple a solution unsatisfactory. Some of these I propose to produce, and may the propounding of them publicize what force and punch there are in them.

It is understandable that we should wish to act on the injunctions of the Church, of that limb of the Church in which we are embedded, to fast. We are told when, but not how. The reasons why we should fast govern in large measure how we do that fasting. In the Communion, of which we are called to be lively members, we shall not be faced with military or magisterial directives; nor will uniformity be expected of us, *deo gratias*, in the matter. But that is no reason for despising or ignoring this old discipline as something suited only to children or slaves; for though it be given us to settle the extent to which we chasten our own flesh, yet this is asked of us for that in part we are yet children and slaves. The policy amongst us, in which we are called to co-operate, surely is this: Let the principles be understood, and then let each one in as mature a manner as he can manage apply them with concreteness to his own condition and circumstances.

"Let a bishop be frugal and contented with a little in his meat and drink, that he may be ever in a sober frame and disposed to instruct and admonish the ignorant; and let him not be costly in his diet, a pamperer of himself, given to pleasure, or fond of delicacies." This is a quotation from the second book of *The Apostolical Constitutions*, a new edition of mainly old material put out somewhere in Syria about A.D. 375. It delineates the general need for abstemiousness on the part of apostolics, and that is the first point to be made. It is not as though the Christian presbyter or any other kind of Christian can adopt the current conventions of extravagance and intemperate use of the creatures on certain days, but learn to do without on the days appointed for fasting by Church custom and ecclesiastical authority. We are committed to a lower standard of living than our neighbours, for the sake of having more to give in alms and to finance things that other people do not see the urgency of getting on with; also for health's sake; also as a perpetual reminder that as yet we reign not, but must press on through mortification to the glory that is our destiny and which has only just begun to possess us. It may be hard to make out a case why the members of the Body of the Ascended and Exalted Christ should fast, but the position with us is that we are not just members of that Body. We are and we are not. As, in truth, we are both baptized and not yet baptized. We are children of God and yet in part still children of the Devil, and because of our double nature it behoves

us to fast, to handle the as yet unsanctified part of us with vigou and care, that it may follow in death the part of us already risen We are as cats with their heads through most narrow railings squeezing their ribs to follow their whiskers. We are both faithfu and yet catechumens, and in so far as we are yet catechumens it be hoves us in all humility to embrace, not despise, the discipline o fasting, toil, and weariness, imposed in the old myth on Adan Fallen, that amidst such things redemption might lay hold of him.

The more seriously one takes all this—and the saintly lights o the several Messianic generations have taken it very seriously—in way the greater is the problem how to observe the set fasts. Wha more beyond one's normal habit of restraint and gentle use of th creatures is it right to do on these occasions? This first consideratio keeps in proportion our whole attitude towards what extra, perhap almost trivial, abstinences we practise on fast days. Those practice are not the sum of our practice of fasting—indeed, may be but small part of it.

Last year the Church Assembly published, and in October th Canterbury prelates commended to the attention of churchfolk, th *Report of the Committee on the Spiritual Discipline of the Laity.* is a step in the clarification of what are the obligations of Churc membership in England in the middle of the twentieth centur On p. 5 there is a section on "Fasting and Abstinence."

> "We would especially welcome the consideration of this matter by t Convocations, with a view to an authoritative statement both of the reaso for times of abstinence and of the forms of abstinence that are most appr priate in modern conditions.
>
> "We are conscious that here particularly it is necessary to guard agair mere formalism. It is the spirit rather than the letter of the law th matters, and the instructed layman will know that he is called to re private self-denial in ways that will vary according to his circumstance But the distinction between the private and the public is again relevan and we would point out that no amount of private self-denial renders u necessary the observance of a common rule. The rule itself may be a ve simple one. The abstinence is not only, or necessarily, from particul kinds of food. It is a curtailment of pleasure with the objects of (*a*) se discipline; (*b*) recollection, in the face of the distractions of ordinary li of the seriousness of the christian calling; (*c*) provision of further time f prayer and worship. Every earnest Christian will make rules for himself order to secure these ends, but the faithful and humble observance also some common public rule which marks off certain days and seasons w strengthen fellowship and be an act of witness to our christian profession

On p. 8 there are proposed six rules for the Convocations to s forth as the ancient spiritual discipline of the laity in modern for No. 3 reads: "To mark, by special acts of discipline, Fridays and t season of Lent." "Obedience to these rules is a duty incumbent up all churchmen everywhere . . . They are not the whole duty of Christian man: they are an inescapable part of that duty with peculiar value and importance of their own."

The Lambeth Conference published a Report on *The Christi Way of Life.* It is the work of a committee presided over by t Bishop of London. The Conference as a whole was responsible f

he Resolutions, but not the Reports. On pp. 38-39 there is a section on "Disciplined Churchmanship."

> "A suggestion has been made in England that there should be a minimum Rule of Life for all Anglicans. It is often said that Anglicanism is so vague that one cannot tell an Anglican layman what he is expected to do. Different Rules of Life are set before him in different parishes, but none of them has any authority beyond its own inherent merit and the particular interpretation placed by the priest of that parish on Anglican formularies. We think that it might be a good thing if the Anglican Communion throughout the world issued some Rule which could be commended to Anglicans everywhere. Such a Rule would have to be voluntarily accepted by the laity. Observance of it could not be made a condition of communion.
>
> "The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America in its Prayer Book sets out that it is the bounden duty of a member of the Church to follow Christ, to worship God every Sunday in His Church, and to work and pray and give for the spread of His Kingdom. The English suggestions are more detailed, but they have not yet been agreed to by the Church of England. In the meantime we desire to call upon all members of the Anglican Communion to remember the responsibility of their position. The great weakness of the Church is not that its members are too few, but that it has among its members too many who recognize no obligation to keep its rules. It would be a most effective witness for God if Churchmen everywhere went to church on Sunday, if they possibly could. It is not just a matter of 'getting good.' It is a matter of recognizing our obligation and so bearing witness to its reality. A Churchman should also recognize his obligation to communicate at least three times in the year, of which Easter should be one; to say his prayers daily, to read the Bible regularly, to make acts of self-denial especially on Fridays and during Lent, and to give generously for the extension of God's Kingdom and for those in need."

There is the question of the public or private character of the acts of self-discipline and denial on Fridays and in Lent. I suggest that it is desirable wherever possible to retain both. When we are in control of our own establishment or family, some open observance of these times is desirable, again in the management of parishes; but in the secular set-up of to-day's society this is often extremely difficult, of dubious wisdom. Last year I heard of a priest and his wife who went out to tea on a Friday in Lent and refused to eat anything, though they drank the tea. They returned home and after sundown had a splendid supper. If that is one's rule, better to do one's visiting clear of meal-times. Again, there is the case of a theological college where really Friday afternoon was the most convenient time to go to the cinema, considering what else was on on other days. Ordinands need not be habitués of the cinema, but there is an argument of some strength for their occasional attendance. As for publicity and its witness, some weeks ago I passed men hewing up the road. One of them had a small silver cross on a chain round his neck. It glistened amidst the hairs of his chest. To work in a gang and thus to proclaim discipleship would be an aid to charity of the tongue, a restraint from pulling all and everyone to pieces. What, indeed, are the secret ways of observing fasts? Early rising, cold water, the wearing of old clothes, extra prayers before the Eucharist, the use of the Litany; all these are traditional, mild private practices convenient to some. Evelyn Underhill once suggested, I think—though I cannot locate the passage in her letters—that at

breakfast, when visiting in a country house on a fast day, the thing to do was to mix mustard with the marmalade and avoid the ostentation of refusing the bacon. But this is out of the frying pan into the fire reserved for the crankified. Many will be pleased quietly to abstain from obvious delights at table on these days, not to force dishes on others, or seek after the reasons for their abstention, but will learn how to answer or turn aside the persistent inquirer into the cause of their own non-eating. It can be a humble proclamation of incorporation into Christ's Church militant; just as is the sign of the cross before and after eating, so convenient in restaurants as revealing to the waiter that one is blessing the Blessed One and not temporarily frozen by a glimpse of Medusa's head at the far table.

In 1703 Robert Nelson, of pleasant memory, published his *Companion for the Festivals and Fasts of the Church of England: with Collects and Prayers for each Solemnity*. It was a much-read book in the eighteenth century. My copy of 1736 is the sixteenth edition. The second part, on the fasts, is prefaced by a bevy of "Preliminary Instructions," from which I proceed to mine these extracts.

"*Q.* What do you mean by fasts?

"*A.* Days set apart by the Church or by Civil Authority, or by our own Appointment, to humble our selves before God, in punishing our Bodies, and afflicting our souls, in order to a real Repentance. By outward significations testifying our Grief for Sins past, and by using them as Means to secure us from returning to those Sins, for which we express so great a Detestation.

"*Q.* Wherein consists the Nature of Fasting?

"*A.* In a strict sense it implies a total Abstinence from all Meat and Drink the whole Day from Morning to Evening; and then to refresh our selves sparingly as to the Quantity, and not delicately as to the Quality of the Food. And in this manner not one but more Days were past in a continual Fast by the Primitive Christians before Easter. In a large Sense it implies an Abstinence from some kind of Food, especially Flesh and Wine, as was used by Daniel: or a deferring eating beyond the usual Hours, as the Primitive Christians did on their Stationary Days, till three in the Afternoon, to which Hour their publick Assemblies continued on those Days. So that hereby some Self-denial is designed to our Bodily Appetites; for no Abstinence can partake of the Nature of Fasting, except there be something in it that afflicts us.

"*Q.* How many Sorts of Fasts are there?

"*A.* There are two sorts, publick and private. The first we are determined to observe by virtue of that Obedience that is due to our lawful Superiors; and for those Reasons they enjoin it. The second proceeds from our own voluntary Imposition, and arises from our Obligation to perform it at some times, though it is left to our own Discretion to determine the Season. . . .

". . . When he brings in the Pharisee boasting that he fasted twice in the week, our Saviour in no Manner blames him for fasting, but corrects his Vanity for boasting of it. . . . Fasting belongs to Mourners but while our Saviour was with them, it was a Time of Joy and

Gladness and consequently as improper a Season for the Signification of Sorrow, as it would be to forbid Eating and Drinking at a Wedding. . . .

"The ancient Christians were very exact both in their weekly and annual Fasts. Their weekly Fasts were kept on Wednesdays and Fridays; because on the one our Lord was betrayed, and on the other crucified. These Fasts were called their Stations, from the military Word of keeping their Guard, as Tertullian observes: though others think more immediately from the Jewish Phrase, and the Custom of those devout Men; who either out of their own Devotion, or as the Representatives of the People, assisted at the Oblations of the Temple; not departing thence till the Service was over. For these Fasts usually lasted till after three in the Afternoon, as did their publick Assemblies. Their annual Fast was that of Lent, by way of Preparation for the Feast of our Saviour's Resurrection. But this was variously observed, according to different Times and Places.

". . . They observed their Fasts with great strictness. All in general on such Days abstained from drinking Wine and eating Flesh; the greatest part fed only on Herbs or Pulse, with a little Bread. They confined them selves to cheap and ordinary Diet, without Sauces or relishing Delicacies. Some used the dry Diet, as Nuts, Almonds, and such like Fruits; others fed only upon Bread and Water. . . .

"*Q.* When may a Fast be accounted Religious?

"*A.* When it is undertaken upon Religious Ends and purposes, to restrain the looser Appetites of the Flesh, and to keep the Body under. To give the Mind liberty and ability to consider and reflect while it was actually engaged in divine Service, or preparing for some solemn part of it. To humble our selves before God under sense of our Sins, and the Misery to which they expose us. To deprecate his Anger, and to supplicate for his Mercy and Favour. To express Revenge against our selves for the Abuse of those good things God alloweth us to enjoy; and of which we have made our selves unworthy by sinful Excesses. When it is used as a piece of Self-denial in order the better to command our fleshly Appetites; and as a means to raise in our minds a due Valuation of the Happiness of the other World, when we despise the Enjoyment of this. Above all, to make it acceptable to God it should be accompanied with fervent Prayer, and a charitable Relief of the Poor; whose Miseries we may the better guess at, when we are bearing some of the Inconveniences of Hunger.

"*Q.* What must we do if Fasting is prejudicial to our Health, and indisposes us for the Service of God?

"*A.* In this case it concerns us to deal impartially with our selves, and not to make use of it as a Pretence to excuse our selves from the Obligation of this Duty; especially when the Commands of our lawful Superiors require the Observation of it. But if it have this Effect, we ought to eat more sparingly and with less delicacy than at other times; and to be more exact in performing those Devotions that ought to accompany our Fasts. The Church aims at our Ad-

vantage in the Rules she prescribes, and is always supposed to make Allowances for particular Cases, which cannot be excluded in general Rules. . . .

"*Q.* Are we obliged to use the same Testimonies of our inward Grief, whereby it was expressed in ancient Times?

"*A.* I think not; because the using of Sackcloth and Ashes formerly, when Men humbled themselves before God, was in conformity to the custom of Mourners in those times, who expressed their sense of Grief after that manner. But then I think we ought to express the same thing by other Signs proper to the Custom of Mourners in our Days. By forbearing our usual Meals, by abstaining from all Manner of Pleasure, by neglecting the adorning our Bodies, by retiring from Company, by laying aside Business, and by bewailing our Loss. 'A Sinner,' saith St Cyprian, 'ought to lament the Death of his Soul, at least as much as the Loss of a Friend': and St Chrysostom makes use of the same Comparison. And surely it will become us to mourn and lament, who have offended God, our best Friend, and whose Favour we have consequently lost, if we are heartily sorry for having offended him.

"*Q.* How is a Day of fasting to be observed by serious Christians?

"*A.* Not only by interpreting and abridging the Care of our Bodily Sustenance, but by carefully inquiring into the State of our Souls; charging our selves with all those Transgressions we have committed against God's Laws, humbly confessing them with shame and Confusion of Face, with hearty Contrition and Sorrow for them, deprecating God's Displeasure, and begging him to turn away his Anger from us. By interceding with him for such Spiritual and Temporal Blessings upon our selves and others, as are needful and convenient. By improving our Knowledge in all the Particulars of our Duty. By relieving the Wants and Necessities of the Poor, that our Humiliation and Prayers may find Acceptance with God. If the Fast be publick, by attending the publick Places of God's Worship.

"*Q.* What ought we chiefly to beware of in our Exercises of Fasting?

"*A.* We ought to avoid all vanity and valuing our selves upon such Performances; and therefore in our private Fasts, not to proclaim them to others by our external Affectations; 'that we may not appear unto Men to fast.' Not to despise or judge our Neighbour who doth not, and it may be hath not the same Reason to tie himself up to such Methods. Not to destroy the Health of our Bodies and thereby make them unfit Instruments for the Operations of our Minds, or the Discharge of our worldly Employments. Particular Care ought to be taken, that we do not grow thereby morose and sour, peevish and fretful towards others, which Severity to our selves may be apt to incline us to; for that is so far from expressing our Repentance, that it makes fresh Work for it by increasing our Guilt."

As I only aim to bring to mind some of the chief considerations inherent in the discussion of this matter, I cannot do better than in closing my quoting from the blessed Robert, make an end of these observations *De Ecclesiæ Jejuniis Observandis.* R. P. Symonds.

# American Letter: No. 2

I. The present writer's memories of the theological atmosphere of the eastern United States cover a period of twenty years, which have seen a remarkable change both inside and outside of the Episcopal Church. In the 1920's the consciously rising movements in the Episcopal Church were Liberal Catholicism, as growing out of and aspiring to replace the older Anglo-Catholic tradition, and an even broader Liberalism which similarly aspired to replace the older Broad Churchmanship. We were the generation of students who welcomed the passage of *Essays Catholic and Critical* across the Atlantic. It had been almost a survival from an unintelligible past when, a few years before, F. J. Hall completed his life's work with the publication of the tenth volume of his *Dogmatic Theology*, rather mournfully entitled *Eschatology: Indexes* (1922). Hall's turgid style did not conceal from us the intellectual honesty and solidarity of his careful presentation of an Anglican scholasticism. But the seminarians of the 1920's were inclined to patronize Bishop Gore as over-cautious, and as far as I can remember we scarcely even tried to understand the theologian who had warned the Church years before against the heresies of Gore's kenoticism. I have lived to hear a Methodist theologian, by no means an obscurantist, speak of Gore and Temple as "liberal evangelicals," meaning by that term theologians who earnestly desired to expound the historic faith by which they lived, but whose real intellectual standing-ground was in the world of modern thought. Out of Liberalism we have seen both positive Protestantism and positive Catholicism come to their own again.

In theology as in politics the United States is still reacting against the 1920's, and some further description of the atmosphere of those days may be worth while. We assumed then that the educated young American would be a liberal in more senses than one, and the most that intellectual Anglicans tried to maintain was that he could still be a Catholic. American Protestantism is perhaps particularly inclined to rapid movement between extremes, and in the 1920's its theological world was witnessing a general victory of liberalism in various forms, only made more conspicuous by the uninstructed protests of retreating fundamentalism. Even at Princeton Seminary, the traditional stronghold of orthodox Presbyterianism, there was a struggle as a result of which the extreme conservatives withdrew to a new institution at Philadelphia, the Westminster Seminary, which later became the spearhead of a small schism from the Presbyterian Church. The most conspicuous theological professorships were occupied by liberals—Macintosh at Yale aimed to make theology an empirical science, some of the teachers at Chicago doubted whether the idea of God was really essential to religion, and at Union Seminary in New York the more constructive and evangelical liberalism of William Adams Brown attracted remarkably little attention. The popular preacher of the day was Harry Emerson Fosdick, whose honourable refusal to give a nominal subscription to the West-

minster Confession prevented his becoming the pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in New York, and led instead to his delivering his message of hope and idealism in the magnificent structure erected for him by the Riverside Church (formerly Park Avenue Baptist) overlooking the Hudson and next door to Columbia University. The history of American religion can best be followed in the careers of its famous preachers; in recent years Fosdick himself has noted that he now turns primarily to the objective truths of the Gospel.

Broad Churchmanship in the Episcopal Church, like American Liberal Protestantism generally, originated in the mid-nineteenth century in a desire to retain the values of evangelical piety while reacting strongly against the previous dominance of Calvinistic theology. One of the early professors at Virginia Theological Seminary, the fortress of Anglican Evangelicalism, is credited with the statement that while he did not consider Calvin infallible he did not believe that he had ever been mistaken. Phillips Brooks, rector of Trinity Church, Boston, from 1869 to 1891, and the greatest American preacher of his age, quite consciously led the transition. Some of his most famous sermons proclaim the harmless proposition that man is not wholly bad, which came, however, as a message of release to his hearers. By the 1920's the absence of a positive Broad Church Gospel could no longer be concealed. Some turned to enthusiasm for social service and social reform—only, perhaps, to learn from their Marxist friends the need for solid thought; others took refuge in the erection of magnificent parish houses. The absence of a strong group of definite Evangelicals became, and I think still is, a real weakness of the Episcopal Church.

I do not wish to exaggerate the influence of consciously Liberal Catholicism among Anglo-Catholics in the period of which I have been speaking. Solid, even rigid Orthodoxy, has never lacked conspicuous adherents. But there were many who felt that our particular vocation as non-Roman American Catholics was to fuse the Liberal and Catholic traditions, to the ultimate benefit we hoped of both extremes. As late as 1933-1934 *The Living Church* published a series of articles on *Liberal Catholicism and the Modern World*, some of which later appeared as a volume under that title. The editor of the series was Frank Gavin, Professor of Church History at the General Seminary, whom many remember as a great scholar and a great priest. He spoke of the aim of

> progressive Anglo-Catholicism . . . to preserve the best of the past in the light of the best of the present so as to build for the best future. It is our peculiar privilege as Anglicans to set forward and bear witness to a Catholicism that is not imperialistic but free; and to a liberalism that has its living roots in the congenial atmosphere of a vital tradition (pp. vi, xi).

If "Father Frank" had not worn himself out by trying to bear too many burdens he would be with us yet, since he was only forty-six at his death in 1937. I do not think he would repudiate any of these ideas, but I am sure that he would lay the emphasis elsewhere. We no longer assume a background of liberalism and relate ourselves to

it in one way or another—currents are flowing in another direction, and we may even feel that Catholicism, instead of trying to redeem a prevailing liberalism, should offer a shelter to the spirit of man from the exigent demands of Protestant faith. But we can welcome the shift now which puts leading Protestants with us in upholding objective truth rather than against us.

II. The revival of positive Protestantism is the most conspicuous phenomenon in American religion generally in recent years. This is the movement of which Reinhold Niebuhr is the prophet, but he is one of the leaders of an army and not a voice crying in the wilderness. Some significance must be ascribed to the general change in the American outlook which came with what we continue to call "the Depression." Under Coolidge and Hoover even the Socialism of the young was rather complacent; we wanted things to be better, but were at heart pretty well satisfied with them as they stood. Since then crisis and war have brought us to a sense of national responsibility, and an awareness that even in politics we stand in the presence of strange greatness and strange evils and live on the brink of the abyss. It will not again be possible for presidential elections to be mere games of personal preference and hereditary loyalties as they were in 1924 and 1928. In part the sense of depth has come into our theology because we met it where we least expect it, in our politics. In part the influence of Continental theologians has given our thought a new direction, a development helped by the presence in America of Churches of German Reformed origin, from one of which Niebuhr himself comes. Twenty years ago I remember that we were hesitantly told at General that there were men named Barth and Otto who had something to say to us; five years later Barthianism was all the fashion at Union. But I do not think that these influences are the whole story. American theologians have become aware in their own field that Liberalism is not enough.

It is amusing to trace this development in particular places. Niebuhr and Tillich now hold forth at Union, and in 1942 the retirement of the great liberal philosopher of that school was commemorated by a volume of essays entitled *Liberal Theology: An Appraisal*, the very title implying that this period was past. At Yale Macintosh's pupils and successors are by no means disciples; and Princeton, after some years of obscurity, has returned to its traditional position as a centre of orthodox learning. One must admit that this latter revival has been brought about by a staff largely from outside of American Presbyterianism—Brunner and Hromadka have taught at Princeton, and President Mackay is a Scotsman who served for a number of years as a missionary in Peru. Currently, even extreme Fundamentalism and strict Calvinism are reappearing in Reformed circles. In the Episcopal Theological School at Cambridge, Professor E. S. Drown watched over the cradle of Broad Churchmanship in the 1880's and almost lived to mourn over its grave forty years later. His chair is now occupied by F. W. Dillistone—it is doubly significant that Cambridge wanted an Evangelical theologian, and that they had to go to England to get one. Drown's

immediate successor was Dr Dun, now Bishop of Washington, perhaps most easily described as a devout and churchly minded liberal; and after him the chief theological influence at Cambridge was Richard Emrich, now Bishop of Michigan, and one of the best of American expounders of Kierkegaard.

This discussion has led into the question whether American neo-orthodoxy or neo-Protestantism has any genuine representatives in the Episcopal Church. The answer must, I think, be that there are not many, though the books of Niebuhr and others are of course read, and our theology cannot be as if this movement had never been. When a group connected with the Virginia Seminary produced a volume on *Anglican Evangelicalism* in 1943, there was little in it which a well-disposed Anglo-Catholic would object to, although he would miss some things. In particular the paper on the Church by C. W. F. Smith was a good statement of central Anglican doctrine and as such was denounced as erroneous by a Protestant writer in the *Anglican Theological Review*. A. T. Mollegen's paper on Ethics stood out as the production of one of the few present-day Episcopalians who have a real appreciation of what it means to make justification by faith (rather than sanctification by grace) the regulative principle of Christian morals. There are some others who represent a similar position—C. D. Kean has attracted attention by his incisive if not always clear combination of theological and sociological analysis of our present human situation. But on the whole the influence of neo-orthodoxy among us is wide rather than deep. Even the middle-of-the-road churchman is usually convinced that he never abandoned the faith to such an extent as to need for himself a call to return to it.

III. In the nature of things one cannot expect to find a movement among Catholics which exactly corresponds to neo-orthodoxy among Protestants. Yet in a sense the liturgical movement has had a similar effect; it has recalled us to the depths of a faith which we had taken too superficially and which we were trying to apply to all areas of life before we had been adequately mastered by it ourselves. An encouraging development is the revival of the liturgical spirit in the rather rigid and businesslike atmosphere of American Roman Catholicism, a movement which had an apostle, or perhaps a forerunner, in the late Abbot Michel of St John's Abbey, Collegeville, Minnesota, and which now has a vigorous salesman in the Rev. Gerard Ellard, S.J., of Wichita, Kansas, and an admirable organ in *Orate Fratres*, published by the monks of St John's. There has been a parallel movement in more than one of the divisions of American Lutheranism. In the Episcopal Church I fear that liturgical study has too often been largely antiquarian and liturgical practice rather fussy; yet we do bring to the United States the priceless heritage of Catholic worship in a form available for popular use. In recent years there have been some commendable efforts to get away from the unfortunate tradition of either Morning-Prayer-and Sermon or Sung Mass-with-Sermon, either of which has too often been services performed by clergy and choir in front of a passive congregation—as in

America the ordinary Protestant preaching service or Roman Mass usually is too. Dr Gardner, now Bishop of New Jersey, introduced the Parish Communion at St Paul's, Flatbush, New York, some eighteen years ago, before we knew that this was a new and remarkable movement. Choral Eucharists at General and some of our other Seminary chapels, and celebrations of the Holy Communion held for University students, at summer conferences, and on the popular occasions of Corporate Communions (such as that for men promoted by the Brotherhood of St Andrew on the First Sunday in Advent), are redeeming the "early service" from the position of a luxury for the professed devout. In Liberal Evangelical circles Dr Suter, formerly at the Epiphany, New York, and now Dean of Washington, has promoted intelligent experimentation in the use of the liturgy—though, I think, with a little too much of the ritualistic assumption that reality must be found through some external change from existing customs. The liturgical movement should not mean taperers preceding the alms up the aisle, but a deeper dedication of the living Body of Christ to God in its common prayer.

Liturgical study with theological overtones has made some progress among us. The late Dean Ladd of Berkeley Divinity School was unhappily prevented by his final illness from producing anything more solid than his charming and individualistic *Prayer Book Interleaves*, which were continued by Professor Shepherd of Cambridge in *The Living Liturgy*. Among other contributions worth mentioning are B. I. Bell's series of sermons on the American Eucharistic Rite, *The Altar and the World*, and F. H. Smyth's search for fuller meanings in *Discerning the Lord's Body: the Rationale of a Catholic Democracy*. In a country where all forms of Christian worship, from Quaker meetings to the Syrian *Qurbana*, are legitimately represented, one might expect that an understanding of our respective liturgical traditions would be a natural way towards reunion. There has, unhappily, been less of this than there might have been. Dean Ladd inspired a Liturgical League, which for some years brought young Anglicans, Lutherans, Congregationalists, and (unofficially) Roman Catholics of Connecticut together to share positively their respective eucharistic traditions and experiences. Under the leadership of a prominent laywoman something of the sort has been done by the churchwomen of Rochester, New York. Regrettably, in my opinion, the "ecumenical services" prompted by the American supporters of the World Council are too often of the type where nobody is really at home. The Protestant reads prayers out of a pamphlet, the Anglican leads in some strange new confession of faith, the Greek priest reads the Lord's Prayer in a way never done in his own Church. It would be better if on such occasions we joined one after another in the various forms of Orthodox, Anglican, and Protestant worship.

IV. A highly significant development of recent years is the amount of work done in America on the Doctrine of the Church. This is important for the reunion movement, since American Protestantism is probably the most ecclesiastical in practice and the least ecclesio-

logical in theory of all Protestant groups. Too many generous souls (I think that the well-known E. Stanley Jones must be counted one) seem to feel that all that keeps us from uniting in one visible Church is the presence of doctrines about it. Rumour has it that when the American Committee of the Faith and Order Commission on the Church was formed, the elder statesmen of Protestantism there assembled found it hard to realize that the topic was a serious subject of discussion. But the discussion up to and at the recent Amsterdam Assembly was welcomed, and I think marks a real broadening of outlook among American Protestant theologians. It is not surprising that Episcopalians have produced more serious books on this subject in recent years than on any other theological topic—one may mention Dunphy's *The Living Temple*, Pittenger's *His Body the Church*, and Wedel's *The Coming Great Church*, three very diverse contributions which range from the conservatively Slavophil through the open-minded Anglo-Catholic to the consciously Catholic-Protestant.

These comments have inevitably suggested that diversity among Anglicans continues, although the points of difference have changed. It may even have increased; I am not sure yet whether the ultimate cleavage in Christendom is not between Luther's *sola gratia* and the Catholic conviction that in the Incarnation God comes to his own. There are some millions of Lutherans in America, and their relation to reunion movements is an interesting question for the future. But in this sense there are few Protestants in the Protestant Episcopal Church or in American Protestantism generally, most of which derives from an Anglican or Reformed background. Within "our Zion," as the old early American Bishops loved to call it, there have been some vigorous controversies, especially in connexion with our rather mismanaged negotiations with the Presbyterians. But there is also a happy convergence among our theologians—as shown by the ease with which our various theological faculties can now discuss common problems. The 1947 Church Congress could reasonably publish its papers under the title *Episcopalians United*. Even through its official agencies the Episcopal Church has succeeded in producing a common statement on Faith and Order, and is now accomplishing, to everybody's pleased surprise, a kind of agreed syllabus of its own for use in Religious Education. The great bulk of serious churchmen and their leaders, lay and clerical, insist on being both Catholic and Evangelical.

E. R. Hardy, Jr.

---

## The Devil and the Temptations of Our Lord According to St Luke

Dr Robinson, in his essay in Theology (February, 1947), has drawn attention to the pattern of the Wilderness Temptations against the background of the temptations of the old Israel. Is

there a similar pattern of temptation in the Ministry of our Lord? The belief of the Apostolic Age that Jesus was tempted in His Ministry was contained in Hebrews iv, 15 ("One that hath been tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin"), and in the Wilderness Temptations of Mark i, 12-13, Matt. iv, 1-11, Luke iv, 1-13. This has been the general view of Christians ever since. Little attention has been paid to the way in which temptation was manifested during the Ministry, although the fact that it occurred has been generally assumed from the earliest times. A study of St Luke's Gospel surrenders certain information which may assist us in the matter.

Two sayings in Luke iv, 13 and xxii, 28 are significant. "The Devil departed from him for a season" and "Ye are they which have continued with me in my temptations." Why does Luke introduce them? Further sayings in St Luke's Gospel, peculiar to the author, suggest that he, more than the other Gospel writers, was concerned to state the temptations in our Lord's life, and that Luke iv, 13 and xxii, 28 are not just general comments, but do, in fact, point to Luke's particular interest in the Devil and in the *πειρασμοί* of Jesus. These sayings stress Luke's desire to show the continuous nature of the temptations which our Lord genuinely experienced in His Manhood, in submission to the Will of the Father, "led by the Holy Spirit" (iv, 1). He does not endorse the finality of Matt. iv, 11, "the Devil leaveth him," but says that "when the Devil had completed every kind of temptation he departed from him for a season," a striking phrase which is not used by the other Gospel writers. The idea of the continuing temptations is further underlined in xxii, 28.

Luke's interest in this aspect of our Lord's life is seen also in his use of certain words. (i) *ἐκπειράζω*—"to test severely"—is used three times in the Synoptics (twice by Luke), and it is found in the LXX, as in Deut. vi, 16, where it is used of tempting God. Both Matthew and Luke use it in their account of the Wilderness Temptations, quoting Deuteronomy: "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." In addition Luke uses the word in x, 25, in the account of the lawyer tempting Jesus. In the variant passage of Mark xii, 28-34 and Matt. xxii, 34-40, Matthew is content to use merely *πειράζω*, "to test." Luke underlines this event in the Ministry as a severe test. (ii) *δαιμόνιον* is used in the Synoptics with reference to demon possession. In Luke viii, 30 Legion's outburst of insanity in Mark v, 9 is turned into a sober expression of fact, that "*δαιμόνια πολλὰ* entered into him." Shortly afterwards, in Luke ix, 1 (the account of the sending forth of the Twelve), Luke changes the words of the parallel sending forth of the Twelve in Mark vi, 7 and Matt. x, 1. Mark and Matthew say that the disciples were given "authority over *πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων*"—"over unclean spirits." Luke has a different reading, generally accepted as "power and authority over *πάντα τὰ δαιμόνια*"—"over every demon." There does not appear to be any other significant interchange between these alternating terms for "demon" in the Synoptics, save here. Luke uses the more deliberate phrase "power and authority over every demon," rather than the less em-

phatic and general "authority over unclean spirits." (iii) "Satan" is used fifteen times in the Synoptic Gospels. Of these, two usages are peculiar to Mark, one to Matthew, and four to Luke. There is no particular significance in the use of the word by Mark and Matthew, but Luke uses the word to emphasize the existence of the Devil—viz., "I beheld Satan fallen as lightning from heaven" (x, 18). "Whom Satan had bound, lo these eighteen years" (xiii, 16). "Satan entered into Judas" (xxii, 3). "Simon, behold, Satan asked to have you" (xxii, 31). (iv) The word *διαβόλος* is used in the Synoptics solely of Satan. It is relevant to mention that in Acts x, 38, Luke records that Peter spoke of Jesus healing "those that were oppressed of the devil"—*ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου*, whereas in Matt. iv, 24 Jesus is said to heal "*δαιμονιζόμενους*."

Luke is clearly interested in the power of the Devil and his demons, and in temptation. He speaks of all this more emphatically and precisely than the other Gospel writers. The nature of the evidence gives additional weight to the importance of the references in Luke iv, 13 and xxii, 28, the first of which infers temptation by the Devil subsequent to the events of the Wilderness, and the latter states that the temptations were a continuous process. It is on these grounds that we are justified in taking this investigation a stage further. If Luke believed a process of temptation to have occurred in our Lord's Ministry, what was it? In his treatment of the matter he introduces material which is not present in the other two Synoptic Gospels. Admittedly he does not link the events with the name of "Satan," but after the failure of the initial onslaught in the Wilderness, it is not surprising that subsequently the Devil used the opponents of Jesus in an attempt to ensnare Him.

The three Wilderness Temptations are concerned with (i) working a miracle to obtain popular acclamation; (ii) the political temptation to serve God and Mammon; (iii) a proof that Jesus is the Son of God without His death upon the Cross. These Temptations proceed at intervals during the Ministry, and are finally present during Holy Week.

(i) Working a miracle to obtain popular acclamation.

| *During the Ministry.* | *During Holy Week.* |
|---|---|
| xi, 16. "Others tempting him sought of him a sign from heaven." | xxiii, 8. "[Herod] hoped to see some miracle done by him." |

Here is the desire for a *σημεῖον*, rejected in cap. 11 in the Beelzebub passage with the warning about the Kingdom of God, and in cap. 23 clearly rejected by inference.

(ii) The political temptation to serve God and Mammon.

| *During the Ministry.* | *During Holy Week.* |
|---|---|
| xvii, 20. "The pharisees asked him when the Kingdom of God would come." | xx, 23. The spies tempt him about the tribute money, to which Jesus replies: "Why tempt ye me?" (most Western MSS.). |

In the first case Jesus replies to this searching question in one of the strongest assertions in the Gospel. The Kingdom doe not come *μετὰ παρατηρήσεως*—"as you hope to catch sight of it" (Moffatt). (Cp. similar questions by the disciples in Luke xix, 11 and Acts i, 6.) The second case is a considered attempt to persuade Jesus to ally Himself with the political aspirations of the Zealots, "and they marvelled at his answer and held their peace."

(iii) A proof that Jesus is the Son of God without His death upon the Cross.

| *During the Ministry.* | *During Holy Week.* |
|---|---|
| xiii, 31. "Herod would fain kill thee." | xxiii, 35. "Let him save himself if he be the Christ of God." |
| | xxiii, 37. "If thou art the King of the Jews, save thyself." |

There is present here first an attempt either to save Him from death or to entice Him into a Sanhedrin plot against Herod. Whichever interpretation we adopt, it would be an alternative to crucifixion. Secondly, compare the phraseology used in an attempt to make Jesus prove His Divine Sonship with the original Wilderness Temptation: "If thou art the Son of God, cast thyself down from hence" (cp. Matt. xxvii, 40). It was the temptation to which He must not yield.

In these seven instances of Temptation, in St. Luke's Gospel, four are peculiar to Luke: xiii, 31; xvii, 20; xxiii, 8; and xxiii, 37.

There do not appear to be any grounds for assuming that the experience in the Garden of Gethsemane (or "the place," as Luke calls it) had anything to do with Satan or temptation. Luke's account differs from that of Mark and Matthew. According to Luke (*a*) Jesus craves no sympathy from the three disciples; (*b*) He kneels, whereas in Mark and Matthew *ἔπιπτεν* or *ἔπεσεν* infer that He fell to the ground again and again; (*c*) only one Withdrawal is mentioned; (*d*) xxii, 43-44 (referring to the Agony and the Angel) was probably omitted from the original text; (*e*) there can be no suggestion of our Lord being tempted in His prayer: "If it be thy will, Father, let this cup pass from me." The prayer is in accord with His constant dependence upon the Father's will. Luke sees Jesus as calm and resigned, obedient to the Father.

There is some evidence in the other Gospels of temptation during the Ministry, but it does not stand out either as clearly or as completely as in Luke, and is not part of our present concern. Whether the pattern suggested above was constructed by Luke consciously or not, it may none the less be perceived, and it explains both his obvious interest in the matter and also the two references peculiar to him in iv, 13 and xxii, 28, which state the continuous nature of the *πειρασμοὶ* of Jesus.

F. J. GLENDENNING.

---

## OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Right Rev. Gustaf Aulén is Bishop of Strängnäs, Sweden.

The Rev. R. P. Symonds, O.G.S., is Tutor of the Bishop's Hostel, Lincoln.

Dr E. R. Hardy, Jr, is Professor of Church History at Berkeley Divinity School, New Haven, Conn.

The Rev. F. J. Glendenning is Precentor of Sheffield Cathedral.

# CORRESPONDENCE

## THE MINISTRY

*To the Editor of* THEOLOGY.

SIR,

It happened that, owing to many journeys, I did not see Canon Ramsey's article *The Evangelicals and the Ministry* when it appeared in October. I write now not to criticize his article, still less to answer it, but only to welcome it. In the concluding sentences of my contribution to *The Ministry of the Church*, I threw down, deliberately and consciously weighing my words, a serious challenge. Canon Ramsey has seriously taken up that challenge. I have long felt that Evangelicals and Anglo-Catholics wasted time in argument about the ministry and the episcopate, without realizing that there are between them deep divergences of conviction about the meaning of revelation, the nature of faith, and the mode of operation of the grace of God. Only if clearer understanding is reached on these matters can discussion of the ministry, the sacraments, and Church order become profitable.

Canon Ramsey's article is fully characteristic in two respects—in its urbane charity, and in its devastating misunderstanding and misrepresentation of the evangelical view. Canon Ramsey suggests that I have failed to understand the Anglo-Catholic position. This may well be so. I would respectfully submit to him that he has not as yet even begun to understand my position. If we can start from the recognition of complete mutual incomprehension (we may find that the incomprehension is, by the grace of God, less complete than it appears, but it is wiser not to assume this at the start), it should be possible, working together slowly and with careful verification of each step, to disclose the wide areas of agreement which undoubtedly exist, to locate and define exactly the real differences in belief, and then, by the mercy of God, to go forward and discover the line along which we can be led to that point at which differences are resolved in a fuller understanding of the will of God.

Canon Ramsey has provided in his article the perfect illustration of this theme. He writes, on p. 371, "A man's eyes and hands and feet are of the *esse* of his body, with functions not normally interchangeable: they are not utility arrangements like his clothes. Yet men have survived and worked without hands, and moved without feet, and (thanks to Braille) read without eyes. But these merciful possibilities do not involve us in doubting that the organs given by the Creator are integral to the body itself in its proper *being* and unity." (For myself, I always avoid the terms *esse* and *bene esse*, having long since become convinced that they are ambiguous and

misleading. I much prefer Archbishop Bramhall's "nature of the Church" and "perfection of the Church.") Reading these words, Evangelicals can only stare and rub their eyes. Is *that* what Anglo-Catholics mean when they say that Episcopacy is of the *esse* of the Church? Because what Canon Ramsey has stated is *exactly and precisely* what Evangelicals believe themselves to be stating when they say that they hold Episcopacy to be of the *bene esse* of the Church. Have we after all been fighting about shadows? But would all Anglo-Catholics accept Canon Ramsey's statement? There are certain organs without which a body cannot exist at all as a body. If the heart or brain is removed, the mere outward appearance of a body may remain, but it cannot in any way function as a body, as a living organism. Are there not those who hold that a Christian body without episcopacy may retain some of the appearance of a Church, but that it is in fact a *merum simulacrum*, which cannot in any way function as a living Church? The point needs to be cleared up. And are there any Evangelicals in the Anglican Communion who regard episcopacy as a "utility arrangement," bearing the same relationship to the Church as a man's clothes bear to his body? I trow not. If it were so, would we have contended so long and so valiantly for the inclusion of an unquestionably valid and regular historic episcopate as an essential element in the Scheme of Church Union in South India?

I am, Sir,
Yours faithfully,
STEPHEN NEILL (*Bishop*).

GENEVA.
*December 17th*, 1948.

---

*To the Editor of* THEOLOGY.

SIR,

You have kindly allowed me to read Bishop Neill's letter and to make a reply. Let me recall what the issue was. I wrote my article not to discuss the particular historical and exegetical arguments of the essays in *The Apostolic Ministry* (with which I have both agreements and disagreements), but to contend with Bishop Neill's statement that the *doctrine* held by the essayists (and, of course, by many others through many centuries) rests upon a non-Christian conception of God. "Those of us who reject the doctrine of Church and Ministry set forth in *The Apostolic Ministry* reject it . . . because we cannot recognize as Christian the doctrine of God which seems to underline this imposing theological edifice."

Mr Symonds, not content to comment upon the contents of my article, spread himself in a discursive denunciation of what he supposed to be my opinions in general. It is difficult to practise shooting in the dark without some blundering; but let me use one or two of his blunders as pegs for a few remarks.

1. "Prof. Ramsey does not dissociate himself from the shaliach-racket." This is rather like saying: "He has not left off beating his grandmother." I have not, in fact, made any contribution to the dis-

cussion of the shaliach-texts. So far as I can judge, I do not think it is legitimate to derive a doctrine of *succession* directly from those texts. But I am sure we ought not to disregard what those texts may imply concerning the nature of authority within the Church. And those of us who, like Mr Symonds and myself, are not Semitic scholars do well to refrain from rushing into extremes of assertion or denunciation, or from using an unpleasant word which *seems* to cast aspersion upon the motives of scholars to whom we have a debt.

2. "Prof. Ramsey . . . nowhere betrays the slightest nervousness" concerning the need for Protestant criticism of "Catholic" ways of thought. On the contrary, I should be nervous at the absence or cessation of such criticism! In my article I mentioned, incidentally, two matters upon which I believe the witness of Protestantism to be important; and the necessity for Catholicism to face up to criticism derived from certain positive Protestant perceptions was elaborated in my book *The Gospel and the Catholic Church* as also in Fr Hebert's *The Form of the Church*. In this connexion I am very grateful for Mr T. S. Garrett's letter in your January number with its description of the Biblical dialectic of the divine institutions and the free action of the living God, even though I should not draw quite the same inferences as Mr Garrett does.

And now for Bishop Neill:

1. Let us be clear as to what exactly his "challenge" was. It is by no means a new idea that beneath the differences of Christians about Church and Ministry there lie "deep divergences of conviction about the meaning of revelation, the nature of faith, and the mode of operation of the grace of God." The realization that "clearer understanding is needed on these matters" is perhaps a *recent* development in theology; but it is not new, and some of the discussions at Amsterdam showed how widespread it has become. In telling us about this, Bishop Neill is not issuing a "challenge" so much as "carrying coals to Newcastle." No, his challenge was his sweeping allegation of a sub-Christian theism.

2. I am sure I have everything to learn about the evangelical position: but in the one instance which Bishop Neill gives of my misrepresenting it, he is very wide of the mark. My phrase, "they are not utility arrangements like his clothes," was merely part of a metaphor (not an allegory), and was not intended as a description of anybody's doctrinal position! In fact, however, the phrase would not be an unjust description of the view of episcopacy held by *some* Anglicans, not to mention those great evangelical theologians, on the Continent and in Britain, who sit entirely loose to episcopacy or reject it as being not "part of the Gospel." And, since we must go behind doctrines of Church and Ministry to those root theological ideas of God and grace, and revelation and faith, it is not surprising if I try to learn from *those* evangelical theologians no less than from Bishop Neill.

3. As to what Bishop Neill says about a *merum simulacrum*, I was using the imagery of a body to discuss *the* Church Catholic, whose life may, in a real sense, persist wherever faith and baptism exist.

Bishop Neill has moved on to discuss the condition of the existence of *a* Church. This difficult question—the use of the word "Church" for particular communities or denominations—of course needs discussion. But it is a *different* question, and we cannot discuss both questions at once within the already somewhat strained imagery of the body.

Yours faithfully,
MICHAEL RAMSEY.

DURHAM.
*January 13th*, 1949.

---

*To the Editor of* THEOLOGY.

SIR,

The sacerdotalism of Mr Symonds and others cannot but astound those he calls the "catholists." He writes as if the Holy Spirit only acted through priests; therefore all those through whom the Holy Spirit acts are priests, according to him. The catholics have never said that God was bound by His sacraments; they have only said, with greater or less emphasis, that there is a real difference, in terms of relation to the origin of the church, between the catholic ministry, of bishops and clergy ordained by bishops, on the one hand, and other ministries in the Christian Church on the other hand.

I fail to see any resemblance between abbot Daniel the stylite and a methodist (or even methodist episcopal) minister. The saint in question, having no inward sense of vocation to the priesthood, eventually consented to regard the determination of the bishop to ordain him as evidence that he ought to be ordained, and he was certainly episcopally ordained, even if the ceremony was irregular.

I can, however, introduce into the debate another Byzantine parallel. At certain times, in certain parts of the Eastern Churches, the bishopric had the size which we should rather associate with a deanery or a large parish, and the bishop was the one cleric who had full education and considerable experience. The educated clergy were under testing and training; they may become bishops if they did their work satisfactorily. The rest of the clergy, those only partially educated, were in the position of assistants, not preaching, but presiding over liturgical services in the bishop's absence. It has often struck me me that, under these conditions, the bishop corresponds to the minister of our reformed brethren; the priest and the deacon correspond to students, deacons, Scotch church elders, Wesleyan lay preachers, and the like. In the Greek Church, now as in the past, there are many laymen who assist the bishop by preaching. There are lay theologians who spend their lives teaching and preaching without being priests or deacons. These are ministers of the Church, whose ministry is really able to be compared with that of some of the reformed clergy, in bodies which do not stress the sacramental functions of the ministry. They are ministers of the Word, but laymen in relation to the sacraments. On the other hand, many priests are, as it were, laymen in relation to preaching, being hearers

of the Word, and doers of it, but not preachers. There are diversities of gifts. Christ has called others, beside bishops, priests, and deacons, to a ministry, but not to the same ministry. And if the ministers of non-episcopal churches have to be regarded as exercising a ministry corresponding to some part of the threefold ministry, why should the priestly order be singled out, as it very often is? Why should not the presbyters of Presbyterianism, the circuit ministers of Methodism, and the ministers of Independent congregations, be regarded as bishops, or, if not as bishops, then simply as theological teachers?

Perhaps the issue between the "catholists" and the reformed traditions is not really about the three orders of the ministry at all. It rather concerns the Eucharist "for the living and the dead," the power of the keys residing in the visible Church, and continuity, in time with the Church between the apostolic age and the reformation, but also in space with the "un-reformed" churches. As, in good faith, we are all trying to serve God, we may well believe that, according to our various convictions, He accepts our various oblations. But that does not mean that the oblations are the same. There have been heresies and schisms with a satisfactory outward succession, and in that sense with "valid" orders. An outward unbroken succession "guarantees" nothing, apart from the beliefs of the community concerned and its intention to be one with the whole Catholic Church by continuity in space and time. But is there such an intention, and is there true belief in the one visible Church as an objective reality in societies which, when confronted today with the question about the apostolic succession, dismiss it as meaningless?

Yours sincerely,

EDWARD EVERY.

29, EDWARD AVENUE,
MORDEN,
SURREY.
*December 12th*, 1948.

---

## THE CONVOCATION OF CANTERBURY

*To the Editor of* THEOLOGY.

SIR,

The disestablishment of this Province has taken from the clergy of the Church in Wales their representation in the Convocation of Canterbury, but not altogether their interest in what passes in its two Houses. Nor has it taken from them their concern that posterity should receive as abundant material for the Church history of our times as we have received for that of times gone by. May I therefore ask the hospitality of your journal to raise a question which might otherwise be preferred by proctorial petition? I refer to the frequency, increasing in recent years, with which their Lordships in the Upper House debate important matters in Committee, and lift the veil of secrecy only for statements often so isolated from their context as to admit of no legitimate interpretation, and for a pronouncement by His Grace the President at the end.

recent example is found in a debate of May 26th, 1948, on the revision of the Canon Law—a matter of wide public interest in Church and State—as reported in the *Chronicle of Convocation*, p. 175:

> *Their lordships continued in Committee.*
> *On resuming:*
> The Bishop of Peterborough said they were not concerned with celebration: they were concerned with the duty of communicating.
> *Their lordships continued in Committee.*
> *On resuming:*
> The President: We will bring that point up again later.

As a report of a debate—and page after page is in this vein—this is useless, and to a rapid reader it may be seriously misleading. Several times since the revival of 1852 individual bishops, provoked by the bills they were called upon to pay, have moved to stop the full reporting of debates in Convocation; each time the Lower House has pleaded that this prohibition would deprive them of their only access to the collective wisdom of their Lordships' House, and the proposal was dropped. Today the cost of the *Chronicle* is a charge, not upon the privy purse of members, but upon the Church; if economy therefore dictates this truncation of reporting, it is no deference to the dignity of the Upper House that its debates should be cut while the Lower House is reported in full. Or if there are cross-currents of opinion in the Upper House which it is deemed politic to hide, it were better they stood revealed; they are not a weakness in the Church, but its strength; they could not be more forcefully opposed than they were seventy years ago, and those the Church survived. Furthermore, the repeated plea of the Lower House has lost none of its validity today; there are those still among the inferior Clergy and among the Laity who look to the Bishops in Convocation for a theological insight combined with practical wisdom not to be found everywhere. We look—and historians will look after us—not for their conclusions and resolutions only, but for their reasons for them and a display of the principles involved. In the debates as they are now conducted, and in the *Chronicle of Convocation* as it is supplied to us, we are deprived of these benefits. I trust we may not improperly ask the reason, if one can be given.

I am, Sir,
Yours very truly,
G. R. Dunstan.

St Deiniol's Library,
Hawarden.

---

# BOOK REVIEWS

Walter Howard Frere. A Memoir by C. S. Phillips and others. Faber and Faber. 16s.

Though this notice may appear a little late, it is perhaps all to the good, for otherwise this outstanding memoir might too easily be

forgotten. It is a fascinating book, and one looks forward to the possibility of a full-dress Life, for Bishop Frere's activities were so many that a Life written by a single pen would weave into a unity his various activities, and the very attractiveness of this memoir, written by various authors, each with a special knowledge of one activity, makes one wish to have a real Life, to which this memoir should be read as prolegomena.

The obvious disadvantage of a series of appreciations is that the subject is seen too often in isolation. The three most important essays are on Frere as liturgist by Dom Gregory Dix, as historian by Professor Hamilton Thompson, and as musician by the late Sir Sidney Nicholson, in conjunction with Dr J. H. Arnold and Dr P. A. Browne. These three chapters, each wrtten by men of eminence in their own subjects, show Frere's extraordinary depth as well as the breadth of his scholarship. In some ways Frere comes nearer to Dr J. M. Neale than any other Anglican divine. Furthermore, both men seem to have had many personal characteristics in common: both had an almost puckish sense of humour, and the bibliography of Frere's work printed at the end of the memoir might almost be mistaken for Dr Neale's list of writings.

Father Talbot's chapter on his life at Mirfield makes one wish that more could have been said of his life as a religious, for he must have worked tremendously hard between 1898, when the Community moved to the north, and January, 1902, when he was first elected Superior, and it must have been during this period, rather than in the earlier period at Radley, that he learned the discipline of the religious life in which he was to train Fathers of the Community.

Perhaps a little less than justice is done to Father Frere's qualifications as a missioner, for the present writer has second-hand knowledge of a mission which he preached at the Charterhouse Mission that is still remembered. There, at least, he let himself go, and sang mission hymns as solos from the pulpit. Further, Miss Underhill's chapter on his spiritual life and influence is a little disappointing, but as she herself says, "the requisite materials simply do not exist."

The chapter dealing with his episcopate is, unfortunately, too short and is too preoccupied with his activities in his cathedral, to the detriment of his work with individuals and the affection with which the people of the parishes regarded him; but the bishop was fortunate in his diocese, for Truro has its bishop as Dean of the Cathedral Church, and it would be impossible for a man of Frere's training and temperament not to make the cathedral, when he had the circumstances in his favour, the central care in his life. He was intensely careful not to allow party spirit to develop in the diocese, as his appointments showed. There are not many bishops who would have chosen a man for an Honorary Canonry because he was a reading man.

Lisescop must have been an extraordinarily happy and religious house, though perhaps a little disconcerting to those who thought

that the religious life ceased with episcopal consecration, and it could have been only a man of Frere's intense spirituality who could turn a monastic house into a holiday home for a month in the year, and back again, without any sense of incongruity.

Without expert knowledge it is difficult to write on Frere's relations with the Orthodox Church, although Dr Zernov contributes an attractive chapter of his personal relationships in Anglo-Orthodox reunion schemes.

Dom Gregory Dix's chapter on Frere as liturgist is an example of how to write conscientiously and at the same time charitably, and may go far to establish Frere's position as a great liturgist.

Frere was one of the greatest ecclesiastics of modern days, and this volume will attract those who were not fortunate enough to know him to ask for a full-length treatment of the subject.

F. E. P. S. Langton.

London.

---

Kierkegaard Studies. By T. H. Croxall. Lutterworth Press. 15s.

It is a token of the range and originality of the thought of Kierkegaard that it has evoked few total critiques but many tangential studies such as, upon the Continent, those of Brandt, Hirsch, and Wahl. After the customary time-lag, Britain now enters these lists with Dr T. H. Croxall's important and often impressive *Kierkegaard Studies*.

The book is timely. For the inflated cult of Kierkegaard in Anglo-Saxon countries during and after the war has recently suffered a salutory deflation. This vehement and often no less irrational reaction seems due in part to a loose but very prevalent confusion between the "existential thinking" of Kierkegaard and, that which he must most have abhorred, the "existentialism" popularized by M. Sartre, and in part to a not unnatural ecclesiastical antagonism to the *Attack on Christendom* which has lately and at long last appeared in an English translation and rallied zealots to the "defence of the Kingdom." The former is found to offend "sound thinking," the latter "sound churchmanship." With the former offence Dr Croxall deals justly, weightily, and effectively, but with the latter in a different spirit and with more dubious results.

This curious contrast in approach and mode of judgment may, perhaps, be attributed to professional preconceptions. For the author writes as, primarily, theologian, preacher, and churchman, and, within that pale, his studies are scrupulous and illuminating, his judgments judicious. His analysis of Kierkegaard's concepts of existence, dread, the individual, the Apostle, the Instant, Repetition, are cogent correctives of much current misconception. His own *obiter dicta*, moreover, are often memorable.

But the contrast observable in his treatment of other and, from the clerical angle, more controversial issues is regrettable. Here prejudgment too often usurps the seat of good judgment. Thus Kierkegaard's climacteric and, as all the evidence amply attests, sanely de-

liberated and carefully timed attack upon the Church as established in Denmark, like his deeply pondered denunciation of what he termed the "æsthetic" in religion and his condemnation of (not, as suggested here, womanhood as such, but) an unholy alliance between the claims of priesthood and procreation, are all summarily dismissed as "lop-sided." It is with a similar Judge Jeffreys' judgment that Professors Jaspers and Heidegger are incongruously coupled and condemned without trial for "nihilism." Is not criticism of this kind itself a little "lop-sided"?

Nevertheless this book is one to be welcomed by all serious students of Kierkegaard's seminal and searching thought if only for the fact that it establishes beyond all reasonable cavil the essential sanity of his existential attitude and, in despite of the too common caricature of Kierkegaard as a grim and gloomy iconoclast, the "love, joy, peace" which were its real and final fruit.

MELVILLE CHANING-PEARCE.

SHORNE.

---

THE WORLD'S STUDENT CHRISTIAN FEDERATION. By Ruth Rouse. S.C.M. Press. 12s. 6d.

Last summer, in the city of Amsterdam, the World Council of Churches came into being. As long ago as 1937 Archbishop Temple had been appointed chairman of the Provisional Committee, charged with the task of the setting up of the World Council, but world events postponed the completion of this work until 1948. Quite apart from anything else that was said or done at Amsterdam, the abiding significance of the First Assembly will always lie in the fact that there the World Council took shape. No doubt many individuals in many Churches, and many groups drawn from a number of Churches, had made this possible by their patient labours through the years. But I believe it is no exaggeration to say that down the years no more honourable contribution has been made to the concerns which brought the Churches together at Amsterdam than the work of the World Student Christian Federation. As Ruth Rouse truly says, the World Student Christian Federation has ever been "an experimental laboratory of ecumenism." It is therefore both timely and fitting that this year should have seen the publication of the history of the first thirty years of the W.S.C.F. Fortunate, indeed, was the Federation to have Ruth Rouse as author, for she herself was in intimate contact with it from 1895-1924. In fact, for twenty-five years she travelled on behalf of the Federation in sixty-five different countries. The result is a fascinating record of those eventful years, which must be read with gratitude by any who have had even a slight contact with any of the national Student Christian Movements—gratitude to God that out of such small beginnings He has so greatly blessed the work of the Federation. Yet here is no mere record of the days that have gone, for much in these pages speaks very directly to the work of the Federation in the student world today. But more than this. Any who desire to understand

something of modern Church history cannot afford to neglect reading this volume, for here they will find told, with a touch of romance, the story of how a movement, which began as a venture "to lure students to become disciples of Jesus Christ as only Saviour and as God," has increasingly become aware of its special relationship to the Churches. More than once the Federation has reshaped its policy in relation to the denominational and confessional loyalties of its members, which in turn has led the Churches to become more conscious of their own responsibilities towards their own members who are students. Yet the reader would entirely misread this book if he failed to realize the costliness of such work. As was said after the Peking Conference of 1922, "One Family under Heaven—how comfortable and easy it sounds. Like a picnic, or Paradise, or both. But it was neither. It was like life itself, often confoundedly uncomfortable, maddeningly difficult, but intensely interesting all the time.

R. Ambrose Reeves.

Liverpool.

---

King Solomon. By Frederic Thieberger. East and West Library. 12s. 6d.

The figure of King Solomon stands out in Jewish history and tradition as the epitome not only of earthly splendour and magnificence—witness our Lord's words, "Solomon in all his glory"—but also of wisdom. This traditional estimate has been seriously challenged, and cogent reasons have been adduced for regarding it largely as uncritical romanticizing by a later age as it looked back wistfully to the days of splendid extravagance before the kingdom had been rent asunder and had sunk into exile.

Mr Thieberger's book is an attempt to rehabilitate the traditional estimate of King Solomon. One's first reaction is surprise that in face of the paucity of material—we have nothing outside the Bible to go on, and only 1 Kings 1 to 11 (with which 2 Chronicles 1 to 9 may be compared) within—the author has the courage to put his hand to a biography of the Wise King, although a large part of the book, almost half in fact, has little to do directly with Solomon. One cannot but feel that Solomon remains a somewhat dim and shadowy figure. He does not stand before us with the vividness with which Saul and David are portrayed in the Books of Samuel. Nevertheless, Mr Thieberger produces a charming and graceful delineation of the character of Solomon as man and king.

In a delightful manner he leads his reader through scenes and incidents familiar to the reader of the Bible. One becomes aware at once of his sympathy with his subject and his insight into the questions he discusses. He is writing about something which he loves and about which he feels intensely. The result is a brilliant piece of writing which deserves a wide circulation. But whether he succeeds in his object is another matter. His whole thesis is to rehabilitate Solomon as the Wise King, whose wisdom brought peace and prosperity to his people. Everything is made to tell in favour of Solomon.

He stands out as a paragon of virtues. The total effect is clever but not convincing. Indeed, one would not be writing in entire sincerity if one gave the impression that this is an objective and impartial study. Instance after instance occurs in which the achievements or failures of others are simply made a foil against which the greatness of Solomon may be seen to better advantage. His own shortcomings are glossed over.

This is particularly so in Chapter V, "Dramatic Start." It is full of unproved assumptions. The account of Solomon's marriage (p. 113), and Nathan's report of Adonijah's assembly (p. 117), and the question of Adonijah's behaviour (p.118) are good examples. Note also the description of David's attitude to Solomon's accession (pp. 119, 121, and 122). The author is surely nearer the point when he describes David as "the shivering King" who "is but an old, broken man" (p. 118). It is probably for this reason that Bath-sheba succeeds with her plan.

An emphatic assertion of the author's own view will scarcely satisfy the critical reader. Note the following: "it is clear . . ." "the only explanation" (p. 128), "this must have been a prearranged affair" (p. 131), "is therefore not a malicious invention" (p. 271), "proves clearly . . ." (p. 76 cf. 111). "Scarcely anyone today questions . . . the 'testament'" (p. 269).

"Looking closer into the matter, we find that he was not at all pleased with the charges to kill Joab and Shimei" (p. 126). "There is nothing about him of the Oriental Ruler, who aims at setting up a world empire" (p. 134). "Despite the increased financial burden, the people must have felt compensated . . ." (p. 155). The evidence for these assertions would have been interesting.

The chapter entitled "The Eternal Fruit" is interesting, but there is nothing here to necessitate a revision of the opinion generally held about the Song of Songs, Proverbs, and Koheleth.

The picture of Solomon as a typical Oriental despot who ground down his people for his own self-glorification, and who frittered away the vast wealth acquired by his father remains unaltered. Yet this book is well worth reading, and it sustains one's interest throughout. On p. 107 "David's concubines" is clearly a slip for "Saul's concubines."

T. N. D. C. Salmon.

Rathfarnham,
Co. Dublin.

---

André Gide and the Crisis of Modern Thought. By Klaus Mann. Dobson. 15s.

André Gide, who in 1947 received at Oxford an honorary doctorate and from Stockholm the Nobel Prize for literature, was born nearly eighty years ago, and gave the world his first book at twenty-two. The publication of English translations of his works began in 1927, and that was long after many were well known in Germany. Now *La Porte étroite* is re-issued in the English version, and two

volumes of the *Journal* make their first English appearance. For English readers a full-length study is overdue. It has not been supplied by Mr Mann.

Mr Klaus Mann, son of Thomas Mann, has known Gide since 1925. It is from the angle of personal acquaintance that he combines biography with a kind of elucidation of the principal writings. He deals with Gide and Christianity. He describes Gide's notorious conversion to communism and his even more notorious disappointment with Russia once he had made a conducted tour of the country. He concludes with a garbled account of Gide's demeanour during the war. But he does nothing to explain the one important matter: why no French cleric, Roman Catholic or Protestant, who has examined Gide's writings, fails to pronounce them evil.

A glance at the beginning and end of his book will show how little was to be expected of him. In his concluding chapter he attributes to one Frenchman entirely imaginary "eulogies of the Axis" during the German occupation of France, and says of another —M Alfred Fabre-Luce—that he is a "civilized and sophisticated liar." This second piece of abuse is monstrous ingratitude. For although now Americanized, Mr Mann is German by birth and upbringing, and not only was M. Fabre-Luce imprisoned, first by the Germans in 1944, then by General de Gaulle in 1945, for his frank expressions of opinion, but also, as I remember, he was the first Frenchman to question—in about 1924—the assumption that "Germany" alone was responsible for the first war.

Mr Mann's last chapter is matched by his first. There, in the idiom of the gossip-writer, he fumbles to justify the inept phrase of his title, "the crisis of modern thought." It is needless to ask how "thought" could have a "crisis." Mr Mann seems to have sojourned in too many different countries—France, Holland, and others—and his speaking of "the crisis of modern thought" suggests that, as a result of so much cosmopolitan experience, he is afflicted with polyglossolalia. Apart from the woolliness of treating "thought" as if it were an organism, he uses an English word with a French meaning. In French the word *crise* is not only employed, as in English, according to its etymology; it is also made on occasion to mean "a dangerous phase." In this latter sense M. René Guénon—an author deeply infected with that Orientalism of which the virus was introduced to Europe by Fichte—quite properly entitles one of his books: *La Crise du Monde moderne*. We need not accept M. Guénon's assurance that the world is now in a phase called in Hindu tradition *Kali-Yuga* in order to recognize with him that it is a very dangerous phase indeed. Had Mr Mann been able to recognize this too, instead of being only dimly aware of the recognition by others, he might have written a book worth reading. For when you view the dangerous phase, not from M. Guénon's esoteric Oriental standpoint, but from the standpoint of a commonplace European—that is to say, whether you view it as a twentieth-century superstitious pagan or as an old-fashioned Christian—Gide is seen to have had a hand in its dangerousness.

If you are a pagan—or, if that is too strong, shall we say: merely sub-religious?—you see the prime symptom of the dangerous phase in Western man's loss of faith in himself. It was short-winded of Nietzsche to proclaim that God is dead; he should have gone on to confront the possibility that man has succumbed at the same time. Today, on the pagan view, man is less able than ever before to apprehend his own reality or to assign to his personal life any sufficient *raison d'être*; and his impotence in this respect seems to have come upon him *pari passu* with the growth of that self-consciousness which he has steadily pursued ever since Socrates button-holed strangers in the Athenian streets or Plato went his studious walks in the olive grove of Academe. When this growth of self-consciousness is taken as now being its apogee, Gide's part consists in his having continued with the task at which Montaigne, Rousseau, Kierkegaard, Dostoievsky, and Nietzsche successively laboured before him, and in having been their worthy epigone.

But if you are old-fashioned enough to profess Christianity, then you see the prime symptom of the dangerous phase in the Church's loss of moral authority. You do not have to suppose that this loss is an effect of causes that have their origin entirely outside the Church. The loss is not made less heart-rending by the frequent pretence nowadays that Christian apostates like Goethe, Dostoievsky, Nietzsche, and Baudelaire were still real Christians unawares. A diagnosis the exact opposite is called for. Whatever depression of the Church has been due to the rise of capitalism, nationalism, and science, it is not the whole story. There has ever been as well the rot within. The greatest obstacle to the continued saturation of men's hearts by the Gospel may have come, not from the activities of ambitious kings and demagogues, not from the rapacity of commercial adventurers, and not from the domesticators of nature, but from the cancerous proliferation of the pseudo-Christian, the false Christian and the fancy Christian. When the Church's loss of moral authority is attributed mainly to these, then Gide's part has been to play the devil with the Protestant tradition in his blood. *La Symphonie pastorale* is about a minister of religion who tricks himself into believing that his carnal passion is evangelical charity, and the significant element in the novel is the glint of gloating that flashes across page after page because frailty's name is parson. It is that gloating, so prominent there, that renders all Gide's fiction from *Le Retour de l'Enfant prodigue* to the post-war *Thésée*, sinister. Gide is not merely a tempter. He is a tempter in the know. There is no sin however secret which he is not ready to suspect in the faithful or to encourage in the faithless.

Mr Mann refers in his own pages to two books of mine, and he is even good enough in one place to draw on me without acknowledgment. I regret being unable to reciprocate such civilities. But still more I wish I might speak well of Gide's imposing body of work. From him I have received only kindness. In 1929, in *Our Present Philosophy of Life*, I already called in question everything he affirms. He retorted by arranging—with André Malraux—for the

book to be translated into French. Moreover, the man reflected in the work is surely of a stature altogether superior to that of any English Liberal of the same period. But how can I honestly deny, that in order to identify the spirit in so much of his chastened but far from chaste prose I should need the resources of all the demonology at which M. Guénon hints darkly in *La Crise du Monde moderne*? Or—to invoke the private knowledge of a demonologist nearer home—that all too often, as I read Gide, it seems to me that I am face to face with his Abysmal Sublimity Screwtape, come in person to replace his bungling nephew Wormwood?

MONTGOMERY BELGION.

PETERBOROUGH.

## SHORTER NOTICES

PRAYER. By O. Hallesby. Translated by C. J. Carlsen. I.V.F. Press. 6s.

PRAYER AND THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. By Eric Hayman. S.C.M. Press. 8s. 6d.

THE USE OF SILENCE. By Geoffrey Hoyland. Inner Life Series No. 5. 6d.

The main objection to Mr Hallesby's book is its title, which is far too sweeping and in no way commensurate with the scope of the substance which follows, concerned as this is not with prayer as a whole, but with two departments of it—namely, private petition and intercession. The core of prayer, adoration, receives only honourable mention, and thanksgiving, hardly less important, hardly more. We strongly dissent from the statement on p. 36, repeated more or less in other places, "that prayer consists in telling Jesus what we or others lack." And it is regrettable that the impression should be given that joy is a normal concomitant of Christian prayer. There are, however, some good things in the book. The fact that intercession involves suffering is well said, as also is the statement that fasting is a help to prayer generally.

In marked contrast to this is Mr Hayman's *Prayer and the Christian Life*, whose substance was a series of addresses delivered in 1946. The book is a telling exposition and explanation of the classical divisions of Christian prayer, in which the first two chapters are of a quality to remind one of such a work as Cuthbert Butler's *Western Mysticism*. Of particular interest and value is the opening chapter in which an account is given of the teaching of the ancient Church on the aim of prayer, and of the way in which this became deflected, through the Reformation, from the vision of God in contemplation to the general subsuming of prayer under the head of petition in Protestantism. Of equal value is the analysis which follows of the springs and mechanics of human action—showing, as this does, precisely where the need for meditation arises. Meditation as such is not prayer properly considered; its aim, as the author says, "is to feed

the heart, to fortify the will," its practice, if we understand him correctly, a "means of presenting to (the will) the right choices." Beyond this, among the many good things in the book which might be noticed, special mention is surely due to his description of purity of heart as "the simplicity of an undivided will."

Mr Geoffrey Hoyland's booklet on the *Use of Silence* deserves and repays very careful reading.

J. K. Byrom.

Stockport.

---

# BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment*)

Association for Promoting Retreats: *Retreat List* (9d.).

Bertelsmann (Gütersloh): Otto A. Dilschneider, *Gegenwart Christi* (n.p.).

British Social Hygiene Council: F. I. G. Rawlins, *The Value of the Individual* (1s.).

Church Book Room Press: *The Minister's Library* (1s. 6d.); E. L. Langston, *John Taylor Smith* (9d.); H. A. Wilson, *At the Lord's Table* (2s. 6d.).

Clonmore and Reynolds (Dublin): B. J. Kelly, *The Armour of Christ* (8s. 6d.).

Council for the Church and the Countryside: *Christianity and the Agricultural Revolution* (1s.).

Dacre Press: Dom Illtyd Trethowan, *Certainty Philosophical and Theological* (15s.).

Edmund Ward (Leicester): A. F. Webbing, *The Two Brothers* (10s. 6d.).

J. and S. Federmann Verlag (Munich): Friedrich Heiler, *Alfred Loisy* (DM 12.0).

Lutterworth Press: B. G. M. Sundkler, *Bantu Prophets in South Africa* (30s.).

Paternoster Press: Frank J. Powell, *The Trial of Jesus Christ* (6s.).

Pax House: Douglas Edwards, C.R., *The Evidence of the Gospels* (9d.).

Rhodes University College (Grahamstown): Horton Davies, *Towards an Ecumenical Theology and a United Church* (Inaugural Lecture) (1s.).

S.C.M. Press: T. E. Jessop, *Reasonable Living* (2s. 6d.); H. G. G. Herklots, *Amsterdam, 1948* (2s. 6d.); *The Message and Reports of the First Assembly of the World Council of Churches* (3s.).

S.P.C.K.: A. E. Henderson, *Fountain's Abbey Then and Now* (2s. 6d.); R. W. Hallett, *To Introduce God* (1s.); *The Christian Doctrine of Man and The Church and the Modern World* (from Lambeth Report) (1s.); A. S. Khomiakov, *The Church is One* (1s. 3d.); H. E. Collier, *Divine Healing in General Medical Practice* (1s.); Walter Carey, *A Talk to a Boy about Religion* (6d.); Clare Dawson, *Loving and Giving* (5s.); *The Report of the Committee appointed to consider the situation in the Nyandal Area* (3d.); E. H. Dunkley, *The Reformation in Denmark* (13s. 6d.); Harold Riley, *The Revision of the Psalter* (8s. 6d.).

University of London Press: J. F. Wolfenden, *The Public Schools To-day* (4s. 6d.).

Waldain Press (Chicago): I. H. Rubinstein, *A Treatise on Contemporary Religious Jurisprudence* ($2.50).

Watts and Co.: Lord Raglan, *The Origins of Religion* (2s. 6d.).

Zwingli-Verlag (Zürich): Konrad Zeller, *Bildungs Lehre: Umrisse eines christlichen Humanismus* (Fr. 16.0).

*Printed in Great Britain by*
*Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher*

HEFFER
of
CAMBRIDGE
for
# THEOLOGICAL BOOKS
**English & Foreign. New & Secondhand**

*Catalogues issued*

Inquiries invited for out-of-print and difficult books.

Buyers of Fine, Rare and Scholarly Books in all subjects.

**W. HEFFER & SONS LIMITED**
PETTY CURY
CAMBRIDGE

*"Theology" Occasional Papers*
New Series, No. 12
## JOHN WESLEY IN NORTHUMBERLAND
By H. POLLARD 1s.
An account of Wesley's work in Northumberland, with details of places and dates.
S·P·C·K, Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C.2

67th Year of issue of
## THE OFFICIAL YEAR-BOOK OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND (1949)
(LAMBETH NUMBER)
**Price 12s. 6d. net; by post 13s. 3d.**
Lambeth summarised. Church Assembly Constitution. Summaries of all Measures. "Who's Who in the Church Assembly." Legal Information. Canon Law revision in Convocations. Church Statistics.
**ORDER NOW** from The Press and Publications Board of the Church Assembly, Church House, Westminster, S.W.1, or from S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C.2

# From MOWBRAYS' List

**THE AUTHORITY OF THE SCRIPTURES.** By the Right Rev. J. W. C. WAND, P.C., D.D., Lord Bishop of London. *Just published.* Boards, 5*s*.

A clear and adequate theological definition of the nature of Biblical authority which the ordinary man can readily grasp.

**THE STORY OF THE PRAYER BOOK.** By the late Rev. Canon VERNEY JOHNSTONE, and the Rev. Canon ERNEST EVANS, D.D. *Just published.* 3*s*. 6*d*.

A popular history written for the Four Hundredth Anniversary of the First English Prayer Book, to be celebrated this year.

**PSYCHOLOGY AND THE PARISH PRIEST.** By the Rev. Canon LINDSAY DEWAR, Principal of Bishops' College, Cheshunt. *Just published.* Boards, 5*s*.

A treatise on modern lines for the parish priest and others concerned with spiritual welfare.

**ST ATHANASIUS ON THE PSALMS.** *A Letter* rendered for the first time into English by "A Religious of C.S.M.V." *Just published.* 1*s*. 6*d*.

This translation shows how the early Christians used the Psalter.

**CAMBRIDGE OFFICES AND ORISONS.** Arranged by the Very Rev. E. MILNER-WHITE, Dean of York, and the Rev. B. T. D. SMITH. *New Edition.* Quarter Cloth, 4*s*. 6*d*.

"A book of devotion of more than ordinary value. . . . The compilation is marked by a rare faultlessness of choice as well as by a large range and variety of interest. It is a book to use whenever two or three are gathered together,' a book for rich and poor, for simple as for educated folk."—*Theology.*

**AFTER YOUR CONFIRMATION.** By M. B. WRIGHT, Author of *Thy Children shall be Taught. Just published.* 3*s*. 6*d*.

"She conducts her readers through the best post-confirmation course of help for the young communicant that I have ever seen."—CANON ROGER LLOYD *in the Introduction.*

**RELIGION AND ANYMAN.** By the Rev. Canon C. C. BELL. *Just published.* 1*s*.

An introduction to religion for the man in the street, approved for the purposes of London Mission literature.

**THEY SHALL LOOK ON HIM. A Little Book for Holy Week.** By the Ven. E. D. K. WOOD, Archdeacon of Mashonaland. *Just published.* 1*s*

Helpful meditations by the author of *The Church that is in their House.*

**A. R. MOWBRAY & CO. LTD, 28 Margaret St, London, W.1**

**9 High Street, Oxford - 5 Albion Place, Leeds 1**

**39 Cannon Street, Birmingham 2 - 44 Brazennose Street, Manchester 2**